

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION*

BY

CHARLES J. SISSON
WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

AND

H. G. ATKINS

VOLUME XXXV



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1940

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

| ARTICLES | PAGE |
|---|------|
| ADAMS, M. RAY, George Dyer and English Radicalism | 447 |
| BARKER, ARTHUR, Christian Liberty in Milton's Divorce Pamphlets | 153 |
| BUTLER, E. M., Rilke and Tolstoy | 494 |
| ELCOCK, W. D., The Enigma of the Lizard in Aragonese Dialect | 483 |
| ESPINER-SCOTT, JANET G., Claude Fauchet and Romance Study | 173 |
| EWERT, A., Dante's Theory of Language | 355 |
| GILLIES, A., Herder's Approach to the Philosophy of History | 193 |
| GREG, W. W., The Mouse-Trap—A Postscript | 8 |
| GREG, W. W., Time, Place, and Politics in 'King Lear' | 431 |
| HARBAGE, ALFRED, Elizabethan-Restoration Palimpsest | 287 |
| HATTO, A. T., Archery and Chivalry: A Noble Prejudice | 40 |
| KNIGHT, R. C., The Evolution of Racine's 'Poétique' | 19 |
| KRAKEUR, LESTER GILBERT, Le Théâtre de Mlle de Genlis | 185 |
| MASON, EUDO C., The New Volume of Rilke's Letters | 506 |
| PASCAL, R., The Stage of the 'Englische Komodianten'—Three Problems | 367 |
| PEGGRAM, REED EDWIN, The First French and English Translations of Sir Thomas More's 'Utopia' | 330 |
| PERKINSON, RICHARD H., 'Volpone' and the Reputation of Venetian Justice | 11 |
| ROBBINS, ROSSELL HOPE, Two Fourteenth-Century Mystical Poems | 320 |
| SEN, TARAKNATH, Hamlet's Treatment of Ophelia in the Nunnery Scene | 145 |
| STROUT, ALAN LANG, Wordsworth's Desiccation | 162 |
| TILLOTSON, KATHLEEN, Drayton and the Gooderes | 341 |
| TURNELL, MARTIN, The Criticism of Jacques Rivière | 470 |
| WALTERS, MARJORIE, The Literary Background of Francis Bacon's Essay 'Of Death' | 1 |
| WELLS, JOHN EDWIN, Wordsworth and Church Building; 'Arey-Force Valley' | 350 |
| MISCELLANEOUS NOTES | |
| ATKINS, J. W. H., A Note on 'The Owl and the Nightingale' | 55 |
| BOLGAR, R. R., Rabelais's Edition of the 'Aphorisms' of Hippocrates | 62 |
| CARE, CHARLES T., Some Notes on German Loan Words in English | 69 |
| DAS, P. K., Cowley and Wordsworth's 'Skylark' ('Ethereal Minstrel') | 214 |
| DRAPER, JOHN W., The Psychology of Shakespeare's Timon | 521 |
| EVANS, G. BLAKEMORE, The Source of Shadwell's Character of Sir Formal Trifle in 'The Virtuoso' | 211 |
| FISHER, MARGERY, 'Bronstrops'. A Note on 'A Faire Quarrell' | 59 |
| FORSTER, LEONARD, An unpublished poem by Philip von Zesen | 530 |
| GILLET, JOSEPH E., Lexicographical Notes: 'Oislo' | 66 |
| HATTO, A. T., Were Walther and Wolfram once at the same court? | 529 |
| LISTER, WILFRED, Notes on the Text of the Middle English Romance 'Ywaine and Gawin' | 56 |
| NOSWORTHY, J. M., Notes on Henry Porter | 517 |
| NOTOPOULOS, JAMES A., The Dating of Shelley's Fragment, 'The Moral Teaching of Jesus Christ' | 215 |
| SEABY, E. R., A sequel to 'Don Juan' | 526 |
| SHAFIN, BETTY, 'Ad Imprimendum Solum' | 207 |
| THOMAS, H., A Forgotten Translation of Lope de Vega | 378 |
| THOMAS, J. HEYWOOD, A Note on Corneille's 'Polyeucte' | 216 |
| TILLOTSON, GEOFFREY, 'Warton' on the Rowley Papers | 62 |
| TILLOTSON, KATHLEEN, William Sampson's 'Vow-Breaker' (1636) and the lost Henslowe play 'Black Batman of the North' | 377 |

| REVIEWS | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Aish, D. A. K., <i>La Métaphore dans l'Œuvre de Stéphane Mallarmé</i> (G. TURQUET-MILNES) | 110 |
| Anderson, C. R., <i>Melville in the South Seas</i> (W. D. THOMAS) | 248 |
| Annali Manzoniiani, I (C. FOLIGNO) | 114 |
| Anseÿs de Mes, ed. by H. J. Green (F. C. JOHNSON) | 550 |
| Baker, E. A., <i>The History of the English Novel</i> , X (C. J. SISSON) | 401 |
| Banks, J., <i>The Unhappy Favourite</i> , ed. by T. M. H. Blair (F. E. BUDD) | 395 |
| Barker, R. H., <i>Mr Cibber of Drury Lane</i> (F. E. BUDD) | 395 |
| <i>Battle of Brunanburh</i> , The, ed. by A. Campbell (D. WHITELOCK) | 78 |
| Beroul, <i>The Romance of Tristan</i> , ed. by A. Ewert (C. I. WILSON) | 100 |
| Bithell, J., <i>Modern German Literature, 1880-1938</i> (S. D. STIRK) | 264 |
| Boyce, B., <i>Tom Brown Of Facetious Memory</i> (G. KITCHIN) | 91 |
| Bray, R., <i>Santo-Beuve à l'Académie de Lausanne</i> (W. G. MOORE) | 108 |
| Byam, E. C., <i>Théodore Barrière, dramatist of the Second Empire</i> (J. DECHAMPS) | 259 |
| Chadwick, H. M. and N. K., <i>The Growth of Literature</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE) | 547 |
| Chakravarty, A., <i>The Dynasts and the Post-War Age in Poetry</i> (G. KITCHIN) | 248 |
| Chamard, H., <i>Histoire de la Pléiade</i> (F. J. TANQUERREY) | 552 |
| Chambers, E. K., <i>Samuel Taylor Coleridge</i> (E. C. BATHO) | 397 |
| <i>Chanson de Floovant</i> , La, ed. by F. H. Bateson (B. WOLEDGE) | 99 |
| Cheke, M., <i>Dictator of Portugal. A Life of the Marquis of Pombal</i> (E. PRESTAGE) | 411 |
| Chowdhuri, B. S., <i>Keats, the development of his mind</i> (W. D. THOMAS) | 246 |
| Christophersen, P., <i>The Articles</i> (S. POTTER) | 73 |
| Clement, N. H., <i>Romanticism in France</i> (L. W. TANGOCK) | 409 |
| Closs, A., and W. J. Mainland, <i>German Lyrics of the Seventeenth Century</i> (I. M. MASSEY) | 558 |
| Colgrave, B., <i>Two Lives of St Cuthbert</i> (H. E. BUTLER) | 533 |
| <i>Conflict of Wit and Will</i> , The, ed. by B. Dickens (G. V. SMITHERS) | 382 |
| Cowley, J. D., <i>Bibliographical Description and Cataloguing</i> (W. W. GREG) | 221 |
| Creed, E., <i>Le Dandysme dans l'œuvre de Jules Barbey d'Aurevilly</i> (J. DECHAMPS) | 111 |
| <i>Defoe's Review</i> , facsimile ed. by A. W. Secord (J. R. SUTHERLAND) | 510 |
| Delpit, L., <i>Paris—Théâtre contemporain</i> , II (F. C. ROE) | 113 |
| <i>Dicziunari Rumantsch Grischun</i> , I (W. D. ELCOCK) | 117 |
| Du Deffand, Madame, and Julie de Lespinasse, <i>Letters to and from</i> , ed. by W. H. Smith (H. WILLIAMS) | 543 |
| Elliott, G. R., <i>Humanism and Imagination</i> (B. CERF) | 93 |
| Elton, O., <i>Essays and Addresses</i> (J. D. WILSON) | 532 |
| Evans, J., <i>Chateaubriand</i> (F. C. ROE) | 105 |
| Evelyn, J., <i>The Life of Mrs Godolphin</i> , ed. by H. Sampson (V. DE S. PINTO) | 394 |
| <i>Floire et Blancheflor</i> , ed. by M. Pelan; <i>Flore et Blancheflor</i> , ed. by W. Wirtz (L. BRANDIN) | 100 |
| <i>Folie Tristan d'Oxford</i> , La, ed. by E. Hoepffner (G. HUTCHINGS) | 407 |
| Franzén, T., <i>Etude sur la Syntaxe des pronoms personnels sujets en ancien français</i> (T. B. W. REID) | 95 |
| Garrick, D., <i>Journal describing his visit to France and Italy in 1763</i> , ed. by G. W. Stone, Jr. (R. WEISS) | 542 |
| Gover, J. E. B., A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, <i>The Place-Names of Hertfordshire</i> (A. MACDONALD) | 74 |
| Gover, J. E. B., A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, <i>The Place-Names of Wiltshire</i> (D. WHITELOCK) | 223 |
| Gramm, W., <i>Die Körperpflege der Angelsachsen</i> (A. MACDONALD) | 77 |
| Green, F. C., <i>Stendhal</i> (L. W. TANGOCK) | 258 |
| Greville, Fulke, first Lord Brooke, <i>Poems and Dramas of</i> , ed. by G. Bullough (B. E. C. DAVIS) | 83 |
| Guillemin, M., <i>Lamartine, l'homme et l'œuvre</i> (L. A. BISSEAU) | 554 |
| Hall, R. A., Jr., <i>An Analytical Grammar of the Hungarian Language</i> (N. J. SZENCZI) | 119 |

Contents

vii

REVIEWS (*cont.*)

PAGE

| | |
|---|-----|
| Harrap's Standard French and English Dictionary, ed. by J. E. Mansion, II (R. L. G. RITCHIE) | 550 |
| Hartmann von Aue, Erec, ed. by A. Leitzmann (M. F. RICHEY) | 415 |
| Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, XX (B. A. WRIGHT) | 89 |
| Hausermann, H. W., Studien zur Englischen Literarkritik, 1910-30 (G. KITCHIN) | 92 |
| Hooker, K. W., The Fortunes of Victor Hugo in England (F. C. GREEN) | 106 |
| Jameson, Anna, Letters to Ottilie von Goethe, ed. by G. H. Needler (H. G. ATKINS) | 262 |
| Karstien, C., Historische deutsche Grammatik, I (F. P. PICKERING) | 413 |
| Kastendieck, M. M., England's Musical Poet: Thomas Campion (B. PATTISON) | 537 |
| Keats, J., Poetical Works, ed. by H. W. Garrod (O. ELTON) | 243 |
| Klett, A. M., Der Streit um 'Faust II' seit 1900 (H. G. ATKINS) | 127 |
| Knappen, M. M., Tudor Puritanism (M. C. BRADBROOK) | 229 |
| Kramet, P. M., The Cyclical Method of Composition in Gottfried Keller's Sünngedicht (R. TYMMS) | 559 |
| Lascelles, M., Jane Austen and her Art (W. HUSBANDS) | 399 |
| Macdonald, H., John Dryden, a Bibliography of Early Editions and Drydeniana (V. DE S. PINTO) | 238 |
| Manly, J. M. and E. Rickert, The Text of the Canterbury Tales (M. GALWAY) | 534 |
| Mann, W., Lateinische Dichtung in England vom Ausgang der Fröhhumanismus bis zum Regierungsantritt Elisabeths (F. J. E. RABY) | 80 |
| Maxfield, M. E., Studies in Modern Romansh Poetry in the Engadine (A. EWERT) | 116 |
| Maxwell, B., Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger (A. HART) | 390 |
| McEachran, F., The Life and Philosophy of Johann Gottfried Herder (E. M. BUTLER) | 417 |
| McEuen, K. A., Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben (P. SIMPSON) | 389 |
| McKerrow, R. B., Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare (P. ALEXANDER) | 386 |
| McPeck, J. A. S., Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain (B. E. C. DAVIS) | 235 |
| Milton, J., Works, Columbia ed., XIII, XVIII (B. A. WRIGHT) | 88 |
| Modern Language Quarterly, I, 1 (C. J. SISSON) | 381 |
| Moore, J. R., Defoe in the Pillory and Other Studies (J. R. SUTHERLAND) | 540 |
| Mornet, D., Introduction à l'étude des écrivains français d'aujourd'hui (F. C. ROE) | 555 |
| Mossé, F., Histoire de la forme périprastique être + participe présent en germanique (A. MACDONALD) | 226 |
| Murry, M., Studies in Keats, new and old (W. D. THOMAS) | 246 |
| Nelson, W., John Skelton, Laureate (L. J. LLOYD) | 82 |
| Newstead, H., Brân the Blessed in Arthurian Romance (T. JONES) | 402 |
| Newton, W., Le Thème de Phèdre et d'Hippolyte dans la littérature française (W. G. MOORE) | 104 |
| Nordmeyer, G., Werden und Wesen der deutschen Sprache (J. M. CLARK) | 120 |
| O'Brien, J., The Novel of Adolescence in France (R. NIKLAUS) | 112 |
| Patch, H. R., On Rereading Chaucer (M. GALWAY) | 228 |
| Petersen, J., Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung, I (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) | 123 |
| Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure, A., ed. by H. W. Hartman (S. G. PUTT) | 230 |
| Petite Philosophie, La, ed. by W. H. Trethewey (M. D. LEGGE) | 96 |
| Preissig, E., Verschiebungsdynamik im Französischen Wortschatz (W. D. ELCOCK) | 94 |
| Pusey, W. W., Louis-Sébastien Mercier in Germany (A. CLOSS) | 261 |
| Religious Lyrics of the Fifteenth Century, ed. by C. Brown (J. P. OAKDEN) | 385 |
| Robertson, J. G., Lessing's Dramatic Theory (E. L. STAHL) | 124 |
| Robinson, H. C., on Books and their Writers, ed. by E. J. Morley (E. C. BATHO) | 397 |
| Rooth, E., Vrastrumt (C. BAIER) | 414 |
| Rosenfeld, S., Strolling Players and Drama in the Provinces, 1660-1765 (C. LEECH) | 239 |

| REVIEWS (<i>cont.</i>) | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Rosenhaupt, H. W., <i>Der deutsche Dichter um die Jahrhundertwende und seine Abgelostheit von der Gesellschaft</i> (W. H. BRUFORD) . . . | 263 |
| Rutebeuf, <i>Les Poésies personnelles</i> , ed. by H. Lucas (J. CROSLAND) . . . | 102 |
| Sainte-Beuve, <i>Port-Royal. Le Cours de Lausanne</i> (W. G. MOORE) . . . | 108 |
| Sawles Warde, ed. by R. M. Wilson (G. V. SMITHERS) . . . | 382 |
| Schultz, F., <i>Der Deutsche in der englischen Literatur vom Beginn der Romantik bis zum Ausbruch des Weltkrieges</i> (L. FORSTER) . . . | 249 |
| Seillière, E., <i>L'Actualité de Carlyle</i> (G. KITCHIN) . . . | 246 |
| Shakespeare's <i>Hamlet</i> , the Second Quarto, 1604. Facsimile, edited by O. J. Campbell (P. ALEXANDER) . . . | 234 |
| Shakespeare, W., <i>The Tragedy of Hamlet</i> , a critical edition of the Second Quarto, 1604, by T. M. Parrott and H. Craig (P. ALEXANDER) . . . | 232 |
| Shakespeare, W., <i>King Lear, The Merchant of Venice, The Merry Wives of Windsor</i> (Shakespeare Quarto facsimiles) (H. SELLERS) . . . | 235 |
| Shakespeare, W., <i>King Richard II</i> , ed. by J. D. Wilson (A. K. McILWRAITH) . . . | 388 |
| Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 74, ed. by W. Keller (J. B. LEISHMAN) . . . | 85 |
| Siebeck, B., <i>Das Bild Sir Philip Sidneys in der englischen Renaissance</i> (A. WALKER) . . . | 537 |
| Sparnaay, H., <i>Hartmann von Aue, II</i> (F. NORMAN) . . . | 121 |
| Stroedel, W., <i>Shakespeare auf der deutschen Bühne vom Ende des Weltkrieges bis zur Gegenwart</i> (J. B. LEISHMAN) . . . | 85 |
| <i>Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature. Presented to Professor M. K. Pope</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . . | 405 |
| Taylor, A., <i>Problems in German Literary History of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries</i> (G. WATERHOUSE) . . . | 556 |
| Telle, E. V., <i>L'Œuvre de Marguerite d'Angoulême, Reine de Navarre, et la Querelle des Femmes</i> (H. W. LAWTON) . . . | 103 |
| Tengvik, G., <i>Old English Bynames</i> (A. MACDONALD) . . . | 76 |
| Thijssen-Schoute, C. L., <i>Nicolaas Jarichides Wieringa</i> (TH. WEEVERS) . . . | 416 |
| Thorp, M., <i>The Study of the Nibelungenlied</i> (F. P. PICKERING) . . . | 555 |
| Tillyard, E. M. W., <i>The Miltonic Setting: Past and Present</i> (B. A. WRIGHT) . . . | 236 |
| Tillyard, E. M. W., and C. S. Lewis, <i>The Personal Heresy</i> (G. TILLOTSON) . . . | 250 |
| Van Langenhove, G., <i>Linguistische Studien, II</i> (C. T. CARR) . . . | 412 |
| Vial, F., <i>Une Philosophie et une Morale du Sentiment: Luc de Clapiers, Marquis de Vauvenargues</i> (E. EGGLI) . . . | 253 |
| Walpole, H., <i>Correspondence with Madame du Deffand and Wiart</i> , ed. by W. S. Lewis and W. H. Smith (H. WILLIAMS) . . . | 543 |
| Warren, A., <i>Richard Crashaw</i> (L. C. MARTIN) . . . | 391 |
| Wartburg, W. von, <i>Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . . | 251 |
| Whiting, G. W., <i>Milton's Literary Milieu</i> (B. A. WRIGHT) . . . | 393 |
| Wieland, C. M., <i>Oberon</i> , trans. by J. Q. Adams, ed. by A. B. Faust (J. BITHELL) . . . | 418 |
| Wilmotte, M., <i>L'Épopée française</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . . | 97 |
| Wilson, R. M., <i>Early Middle English Literature</i> (J. L. PALMER) . . . | 384 |
| Wordsworth and Coleridge. <i>Studies in honor of G. M. Harper</i> , ed. by E. L. Griggs (E. C. BATHO) . . . | 397 |
| Wordsworth, W. and D., <i>The Letters of: The Later Years</i> , ed. by E. de Selincourt (A. BEATTY) . . . | 240 |
| <i>Work in Progress, 1939</i> , ed. by J. M. Osborn and R. G. Sawyer (C. J. SISSON) . . . | 72 |
| <i>Year's Work in Modern Language Studies, The, IX, X</i> , ed. by L. W. Tancock and A. Gillies (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . . | 547 |
| SHORT NOTICES | |
| Baker, E. A., <i>The History of the English Novel, IX</i> (G. TILLOTSON) . . . | 269 |
| Bettex, A. W., <i>The German Novel of Today</i> (H. G. ATKINS) . . . | 274 |
| Breul, K., <i>Cassell's German Dictionary</i> , rev. by J. H. Lepper and R. Kottenhahn, II (H. G. ATKINS) . . . | 424 |

SHORT NOTICES (*cont.*)

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Bronson, B. H., Joseph Ritson (E. C. BATHO) | 421 |
| Brooks, C., Modern Poetry and the Tradition (J. BENNETT) | 270 |
| Bushee, A. H., Three Centuries of Tirso de Molina (W. C. ATKINSON) | 137 |
| Camacho, M. D., Judith Gautier (L. A. BISSON) | 136 |
| Charlton, H. B., 'Romco and Juliet' as an Experimental Tragedy (C. J. SISSON) | 268 |
| Classe, A., The Rhythm of English Prose (F. PYLE) | 272 |
| Cooper, L., Aristotelian Papers (L. SOLOMON) | 267 |
| Ehmer, H., Die sachsische Siedlungen auf dem französischen 'Litus Saxonicum' (A. MACDONALD) | 128 |
| Eickmann, W. T., The Semasiological Development of the Pronominal Adverbs of Motion in Old High German (J. M. CLARK) | 424 |
| Françon, M., Notes sur l'Esthétique de la Femme au XVI ^e siècle (F. J. TANQUERREY) | 565 |
| Françon, M., Poèmes de Transition: Rondeaux du MS. 402 de Lille (W. J. ENTWISTLE) | 133 |
| Franz, W., Shakespeare-Grammatik, 4 ed. (S. POTTER) | 129 |
| Galt, J., The Gathering of the West, ed. by B. A. Booth (W. HUSBANDS) | 422 |
| Gilman, W. E., Milton's Rhetoric (A. BARKER) | 560 |
| Goodell, M., Three Satirists of Snobbery (G. KITCHIN) | 271 |
| Gutenberg, S., Germanische Frühzeit in den Berichten der Antike (C. T. CARR) | 138 |
| Ignoto Ricettario Medico Inglese del XIV Secolo, Un, ed. by T. Vallesse (R. WEISS) | 560 |
| Kingis Quair, The, ed. by W. M. Mackenzie (A. MACDONALD) | 267 |
| Knight, G. W., The Burning Oracle (B. E. C. DAVIS) | 268 |
| Lafourcade, G., Arnold Bennett (W. D. THOMAS) | 271 |
| Luquens, F. B., Spanish American Literature in the Yale University Library (W. J. ENTWISTLE) | 567 |
| MacNeice, L., Modern Poetry (G. TILLOTSON) | 131 |
| McKee, K. N., The Rôle of the Priest on the Parisian Stage during the French Revolution (H. J. HUNT) | 565 |
| Mélanges de Linguistique et de Littérature (Walberg Festschrift) (W. J. ENTWISTLE) | 131 |
| Muller, W., Die Grundbegriffe der gesellschaftlichen Welt in den Werken des Abbé Prévost (J. LOUGH) | 135 |
| Occident (W. J. ENTWISTLE) | 564 |
| Oxford Book of Christian Verse, The, ed. by Lord D. Cecil (C. J. SISSON) | 563 |
| Palfrey, T. R., J. G. Fucilla and W. C. Holbrook, A Bibliographical Guide to the Romance Languages and Literatures (L. W. TANCOCK) | 564 |
| Palmer, P. M., Neuweltwörter im Deutschen (A. C. DUNSTAN) | 567 |
| Pastoral Elegy, The, ed. by T. P. Harrison, Jr. (B. E. C. DAVIS) | 562 |
| Pestell, T., Poems, ed. by H. Buchan (J. BENNETT) | 420 |
| Restrup, O., Heinrich von Morungen (R. J. McCLEAN) | 273 |
| Revista de Filología Hispánica (W. J. ENTWISTLE) | 564 |
| St Amour, M. P., Study of the Villancico up to Lope de Vega (W. J. ENTWISTLE) | 566 |
| Schirmer, W., Geschichte der englischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, I (A. MACDONALD) | 128 |
| Silver, I., The Pindaric Odes of Ronsard (A. TILLEY) | 133 |
| Sorkin, M., Paul Scarron's Adaptations of the Comedia (G. HAINSWORTH) | 134 |
| Studies in English, 1938, University of Texas (W. M. T. DODDS) | 563 |
| Taylor, W., Doughty's English (S. POTTER) | 130 |
| Temple, Sir W., Three Essays, ed. by F. J. Fielden (G. KITCHIN) | 561 |
| Templeman, W. D., The Life and Work of William Gilpin (E. C. BATHO) | 421 |
| Thomas, R. H., The Classical Ideal in German Literature, 1755-1805 (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) | 273 |
| Tobin, J. E., Eighteenth Century English Literature and its Cultural Background. A Bibliography (G. TILLOTSON) | 562 |

| SHORT NOTICES (<i>cont.</i>) | PAGE |
|---|--------------------|
| Torres-Rioseco, A , La Novela en la América Hispana (W. C. ATKINSON) | 272 |
| Vendryes, J., La Position Linguistique du Celtique (K. JACKSON) | 422 |
| Vossler, K., Einführung in die Spanische Dichtung des Goldenen Zeitalters (W. C. ATKINSON) | 137 |
| Wecter, D., Edmund Burke and his Kinsmen (A. R. HUMPHREYS) | 130 |
| Whitfield, I. T., Louisiana French Folk-Songs (W. J. ENTWISTLE) | 423 |
| NEW PUBLICATIONS | 139, 276, 426, 568 |

THE LITERARY BACKGROUND OF FRANCIS BACON'S ESSAY 'OF DEATH'

It is generally acknowledged that the consideration of death was of considerable importance in the production of the literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in some of its most characteristic forms. Certain marked features of this consideration of mortality provide interesting light on the formation of a literary fashion which was, in part at least, the background for Francis Bacon's essay *Of Death*.

Structurally, Bacon's essay falls into two parts: the first a distillation, brief and telling, of the philosophy of dying; the second a brief catalogue of different ways of meeting death, gathered from the historians. In the first part there is a curious interplay of absorption and detachment:

Certainly, the contemplation of death, as the wages of sin and passage to another world, is holy and religious, but the fear of it, as a tribute due unto nature, is weak. Yet in religious meditations there is sometimes mixture of vanity and of superstition.¹

The interplay of moods would seem to be a conscious juxtaposition of the notion of mortification, or Christian preparation, and the notion of Stoic resignation; and the prevailing mood is rather one of Stoic investigation into the various manners of death, than a Christian catalogue of the methods whereby death may be overcome. Death may open the 'gate of good fame', but it is not seen, in this essay, as a doorway leading from self-denial to the kingdom of rewards.

But above all, believe it, the sweetest canticle is, *Nunc dimittis*; when a man hath obtained worthy ends and expectations.²

A full and successful life, not a life of self-mortification, is Bacon's recommendation for a peaceful death.

The 'moods' of Bacon's essay assume a fresh interest if they are considered in relation to the larger phases of contemporary opinion concerning the problem of death. The Renaissance evolved, as every age evolves, its own attitude to death. This was not in any way an original attitude: the return of the 'Pestilence', and the general political and economic uncertainty of the times, made men conscious of comforting affinities with certain other responses made in the past to the challenge of mortality.

Two responses were particularly important for those who turned to tradition in this matter: those made by Christian piety and Roman

¹ *Works*, edited Ellis, Spedding and Heath, vi, 379.

² *Ibid.*, p 380.

2 *Literary Background of Francis Bacon's Essay 'Of Death'*

fortitude, the one a heritage from the early Church strengthened in England by Reformation zeal, and the other derived from the Stoic philosophy of the ancients in general, and from Seneca the Younger in particular. Thus there are two markedly different responses to the challenge that death is universal and is no respecter of time, place, or person. The Roman attitude considers calmly:

Let vs therefore examine all the pointes of this life. Our entrie is in teares, our proceeding in sweate and labour, and our ending in bitter sorowe. High and lowe, rich and poore, none in the vniuersall worlde can saye him self exempt from this condition. Man is wurse then beasts in these points.¹

It concludes:

...to passe frō age to age, is but to departe from one euil to an other; from a small one to a greater, and that it is alwaies one billow or wane druing of an other, vntil we come to the Hauē of Death...To be breef, that in all our life is nothing certain nor assured, but only the certaintye and assurance of death.²

The Christian attitude also insists upon this gloomy view of life, but without deriving a Stoic satisfaction from it. The doctrine of spiritual preparation finds its way into certain types of mortality literature at this time. Sermons and Meditations provide obvious instances. The Christian premiss is the same as the Roman:

This preparation to dye, perteyneth vnto all: for neither riche, nor poore: olde, nor yonge: Prince nor people: Death lets escape...Our life is like a stage, on which men play theyr partes and passe away.³

But the resulting Christian conclusion is different from the Roman. The Christian attitude implies not so much the acceptance of facts, as the desire to utilize the opportunity for temporary mortification so as to obtain eventually a state of perpetual beatitude. 'Mr William Covvper, minister of God's word', in his *Defiance to Death* (1610), puts the usual Christian argument, based in this case upon that put in the *De Civitate Dei* by Saint Augustine:

It is therefore, a special point of wisdom so to liue that by liuing wee may learne to die, that a godly life may prepare the way to a happy death, and a happy death may make vs sure of a ioyfull resurrection: these three follow one vpon another inseparable; if the life be good, the death whateuer it be, cannot be euill: *Nunquam mala mors putanda est, quam bona praececessit uita.*⁴

There is very little of this conception of mortification in the work of Francis Bacon. His *Meditationes Sacrae* deal rather with the methods

¹ *The Defence of Death* containing a moste excellent discourse of Life and Death written in French by Philip de Mornaye, Gentleman. And done into English by E. A. 1577, fol. A vi r.

² *Ibid.*

³ *A Lively Anatomie of Death* by John More, preacher of the Gospel, 1596, fol. E 4 v.

⁴ Printed by I. W. for Iohn Budge, pp. 3, 4.

of preparation for the business of living than with mortification in preparation for dying.

Therefore all hope is to be employed upon the life to come in heaven: but here on earth, by how much purer is the sense of things present, without infection or tincture of imagination, by so much wiser and better is the soul.¹

Bacon, in fact, avoids the Reformation attitude to death. There is in his work none of the dwelling upon the momentary horrors of death with the intention of magnifying the joys of after-life—the concept that was so real to Protestant England, perhaps additionally so because the new system had ‘abolished’ Purgatory. One example of the fine if imitative Hebraisms produced by the attitude of mind which Bacon avoids will illustrate the Reformation ardour in preparation:

Many make a couenant with Death, and clap hands with the graue, hoping thereby to escape, and so to bathe themselves in their fleshly pleasures, and wallow like Swine in their filthnesse. . . . Their hope is as the wind, and their confidence like the Cobweb. Death is a terrour, and a tormentour, both to soule and body: and this is the reason, they haue not learned to dye.²

Apart from the allusion to ‘friars’ books of mortification’ and the comment that in religious meditations there is sometimes ‘vanity and superstition’,³ Bacon does not concern himself strictly with the business of Christian preparation. His Prayers and Meditations are composed in the Christian manner, but not with the Puritan preoccupation with reward and punishment.

Bacon is far more interested in the Roman preparation for death, to judge from the remarks which he collects in his essay *Of Death*. This familiar essay indeed throws remarkable light on the source of Roman comfort in this matter. Its arguments are derived from Seneca; in much the same way the arguments of other Renaissance men of letters on this subject may be shown to emanate consciously from Senecan philosophy.⁴ The respect in which Seneca’s moral philosophy was held was such as to rank him with Solomon in the capacity of adviser to the Renaissance. The Sire de Mornay, for instance, making the best, in typical Renaissance manner, of the Christian and Roman worlds, quotes Solomon and Seneca side by side, in order to minimize the alleged pains of death, and comes

¹ *Works*, vii, 248.

² John More, *op. cit.*, foll. B 2 r, *et seq.*

³ *Essay Of Death*, p. 379.

⁴ Seneca’s influence on the drama has received much attention. The effect of his moral philosophy has been comparatively neglected. Cf. for example, Pierre Charron, *De la Sagesse*, Paris, 1604: ‘C’est chose excellente que d’apprendre à mourir . . . *male viuet, quisquis nesciet bene mori*, etc.’ (Seneca), lib. 2, p. 450. The ensuing dissertation—*Se Tenir Toujours prest a la mort*—is illustrated from the Senecan Epistles, cf. pp. 458, 451, 457.

4 *Literary Background of Francis Bacon's Essay 'Of Death'*

eventually to the fine Senecan conclusion that it is the mark of the foolish to fear death

They had rather languish perpetually in y^e pain of y^e Goute, the Sciatica, y^e ston or such like, th^{an} at once to die of a sweet death, which comprehendeth the least sorow in y^e world.¹

Bacon's response to this type of consolation was to find, as Rawley says, 'a receipt for the gout'.² Nevertheless, he was not unattracted by the Roman ideal of fortitude. He was certainly not unimpressed by Seneca's exposition of it.

Senecan Stoicism was congenial to the age. To counteract the swift unseen approach of death, many of the writers and thinkers of the time cultivated a slow and methodized philosophical discipline --the formation of the Roman attitude of mind. In this exercise of the moral and literary faculties Seneca was held to be the ally and mentor. Thus the Sire de Mornay appends to his *Defence of Death*, itself largely based upon Senecan arguments, supporting '...collections gathered out of the works of the lerned Philosopher Seneca, concerning the same argument'. The literature of death is full of the wisdom of Seneca: it is here that Bacon must be seen as making his comments.

The essence of Senecan teaching is that death, properly regarded, will exorcize the capacity for fear itself. It is not difficult to appreciate the attraction which this attitude must have had for Bacon's contemporaries. Death, according to this view, is to be regarded as a release from life:

Una est catena, quae nos alligatos tenet, amor vitae, qui ut non est abiiciendus, ita minuendus est, ut si quando res exiget, nihil nos detineat nec impediat, quo minus parati simus, quod quandoque faciendum est, statim facere.³

Renaissance philosophy could rest on this certainty: death was a release from life, and life was only

A *Penelopes* web wherein we are always doing & vndoing: a sea open to all winds, which sometime within, sometime without neuer cease to torment vs· a wearie journey through extreme heats, and colds, ouer high mountaines, steepe rockes, and theenish deserts.⁴

The necessity was, therefore, to rid oneself of the fear to lose life: this was, in Stoic philosophy, not difficult, but a question of training. Thus the universality of death was a matter not for despair but for comfort.

¹ Philip de Mornay, *op. cit.*, see foll. C r. and D vi r. Seneca, *Epistle* xxiv. Cf. a sermon, *A Defiance to Death*, by John Gavle, 1630, where Seneca and the Apostle Paul are adduced side by side to minimize the attraction of life. See pp. 5, 6.

² *Life of Bacon, Works*, i, 17.

³ Seneca, *Epistle* xxvi; cf. *Epistle* iv.

⁴ *A Discourse of Life and Death*. . ., by Philip Mornay. Done into English by the Countess of Pembroke, 1600 (earlier ed. 1592), fol. A 2 v.

Vita enim exceptione mortis data est; ad hanc itur. Quam ideo timere dementis est, quia certa expectantur, dubia metuuntur! Mors necessitatem habet aequam et invictam.¹

Bacon uses the Stoic argument to explain the false reputation of terror which death has acquired.

Men fear Death, as children fear to go in the dark; and as that natural fear in children is increased with tales, so is the other. Certainly, the contemplation of death, as the wages of sin and passage to another world, is holy and religious; but the fear of it, as a tribute due unto nature, is weak.²

It is the 'tales' of death which make it fearful.

'Quod vides accidere pueris', writes Seneca, 'hoc nobis quoque maiusculis pueris evenit: illi quos amant, quibus adsueverunt, cum quibus ludunt, si personatos vident, expavescent. Non hominibus tantum, sed rebus persona demenda est et reddenda facies sua.'³

Death is not to be feared: only the 'shows' of death make it seem so. Bacon quotes 'Pompa mortis magis terret, quam mors ipsa',⁴ from Seneca's 'Tolle istam pompam, sub qua lates et stultos territas!'⁵ Moreover, death is not a strange thing, for we die every day:

Cotidie enim demitur aliqua pars vitae, et tunc quoque, cum crescimus, vita decrescit.⁶

'And what else I pray you', says the Sire de Mornay, 'is the beginning of youth but the death of infancie? the beginning of māhood, but the death of youth? the beginning of tomorrow, but the death of today?'

'It is as natural', says Bacon, 'to die as to be born; and to a little infant, perhaps, the one is as painful as the other.'⁷

Bacon again refers to Seneca in the same strain, in the essay. 'Nay Seneca', he writes, 'adds niceness to satiety' (in the reasons for desiring rather than fearing death):

Cogita quamdiu eadem feceris; mori velle, non tantum fortis, aut miser, sed etiam fastidiosus potest. A man would die, though he were neither valiant nor miserable, only upon a weariness to do the same thing so oft over and over.⁸

from Seneca's peroration to *Epistle* xxiv:

Multi sunt, qui non acerbum iudicent vivere, sed supervacuum.

Bacon was interested, then, no less than his contemporaries, in Senecan advice on how to face death. But Bacon makes his own reservations.

¹ Seneca, *Epistle* xxx; cf. 'C'est folie que de craindre ce que l'on ne peut euter. *Dementis est timere mortem . . . mors habet necessitatem aequam et invictam*,' P. Charron, *op. cit.*, p. 458.

² *Essay Of Death*, p. 379.

³ *Epistle* xxiv; cf. P. de Mornay 'Behold, now comes death vnto vs: Behold her whose approach we so much feare We are now to consider whether she be such as we are made to beleue. . . . We are a frayde of her. but like litle children of a vizard, or of the Images of *Hecate*. We have her in horreur. but because we conceiue her not as she is, but ougly, terrible and hideous: such as it pleaseth the Painters to represent unto vs on a wall' (*A Discourse of Life and Death*, fol. E r.)

⁴ *Essay Of Death*, p. 379.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Essay Of Death*, p. 380.

⁵ *Epistle* xxiv.

⁷ P. de Mornay, *op. cit.*, fol. A 5 r.

⁹ *Ibid.*

6 *Literary Background of Francis Bacon's Essay 'Of Death'*

His conclusion is not Senecan, as the Sire de Mornay's or Pierre Charron's were. Although he quotes approvingly a great deal of Seneca's moral philosophy, Bacon does not yield unequivocally to Stoic persuasion. He was unable to subscribe to the belief that a Christian preparation for a good death involved a certain amount of mortification in this life. In the same way he agreed with Seneca that death was not to be feared, but not that life was unattractive. He makes a searching criticism of Stoic discipline in the *Advancement of Learning*, where he reviews the subject:

And it seemeth to me, that most of the doctrines of the philosophers are more fearful and cautionary than the nature of things requireth. So have they increased the fear of death in offering to cure it. For when they would have a man's whole life to be but a discipline or preparation to die, they must needs make men think that it is a terrible enemy against whom there is no end of preparing.¹

The same judgement is pronounced in the essay:

Certainly the Stoics bestowed too much cost upon death, and by their great preparations made it appear more fearful.²

The same conclusion is given in both cases:

Better saith the poet:

*Qui finem vitae extremum inter munera ponat
Naturae.*³

Bacon's researches were concerned with life, not death. Death was, for him, the end of a natural process, not a test of piety or of mental endurance. These things came second. Nevertheless, like the rest of his age he was impressed by stories of those who made a fine end. Such an interest bears out Seneca's advice to Lucilius:

In quaecumque partem rerum vel civilium vel externarum memoriam miseris, occurrent tibi ingenia aut profectus aut impetus magni.⁴

It was an idea such as this which must have prompted the inclusion in the Baconian common-place book of longevity (the existence of which is indicated by the abundance of examples and anecdotes used in the *Historia Vitae et Mortis*, and a selection from which appears in the exemplary second half of the essay) of certain examples of fine dying. Samples of the cases collected are given in the illustrations gathered from historians ranging from Suetonius to Tacitus, in the essay.

Bacon's primary interest is more active than Senecan Stoicism in this matter of investigation of death. He utilizes Senecan arguments to prove his point that death is neither fearful nor nauseating. But he goes further: here he leaves Renaissance Stoicism and Seneca. It is illuminating to

¹ *Works*, III, 427.

³ *Ibid.*; cf. Juvenal, *Sat.* x, 357.

² *Ibid.*, VI, 380.

⁴ Seneca, *Epistle* xxiv.

consider his interest in death and decomposition compared with that of the average Renaissance moralist who contrived to combine medieval mortification with Senecan fortitude. Thus Lady Jane Grey, if it was she who wrote the treatise on death attributed to her, schools herself to consider death in the manner of the discipline of the age:

Afterwarde, whan death knocketh at the dore, then begynneth the greatest trouble to worke. Whan the diseases be fallen upō the body of man in greater number, they are agaynst all the members in the whole bodi, breaking in bi heapes with notable grefes so that the power of the body is weakened, the mynde cumbered, the remembraunce astonied, reason blynded, slepe hundred, the senses all to broken. By meanes whereof, the eyes are darkened, the face is pale, the fete are cold, the handes blacke, the members out of course, the brow hardened, the chynne fallen downe, y^e breath minisheth, the deadlie sweate breaketh out: Yea the whole mā is takē in, and disturbed, in suche sorte, that he is now past mīding of any other thing. Death also is so much the more bytter and terrible, because that the feble discomforted nature, doth paint the horrible ymage of death, to depe in itself, and feareth it to sore.¹

Bacon writes similarly, but with all the difference between emotionalism and scientific interest in his words. Compared with the Baconian calm accuracy, Lady Jane's description must be put in the category of Juliet's tears for which Bacon had no time. He writes:

The immediate signs which precede death are, great restlessness and tossing of the body, fumbling of the hands, hard clutching and grasping, teeth firmly set, a hollow voice, trembling of the lower lip, pallor of the face, a confused memory, loss of speech, cold sweats, elongation of the body, . . . and the like.²

Thus whereas good Christians and determined Stoics set out to confront, examine and accept this picture of physical ruin, Bacon sets out to investigate. The mood of the essay passes into the mood of the militant scientist. The Stoic philosopher sets himself a task not of submission but of attack. His examples of ways of dying are not so much the props which support the philosopher at the gate to eternity but the data which the scientist collects in his attack on death. Bacon's scientific method is to collect examples of long-lived men and to search for decisions by induction (including comparison with statistics of longevity in animals), with regard to diet and methods of living, whereby men may endure more comfortably and even prolong their span of life:

Such then are the true ways of natural death, which deserve to be well and carefully considered. For how can a man, who knows not the ways of nature, meet and turn her?³

MARJORIE WALTERS.

OXFORD.

¹ *A most frutefull pithye and learned treatise, how a Christen mā ought to behave . . . in the danger of death*, pp. 14, 15, 1555 (?). (Said to be by Jane Grey: but probably trans. from the Dutch or German by Miles Coverdale.)

² *Historia Vitae et Mortis, Works*, v, 316.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 218, 9.

THE MOUSE-TRAP—A POSTSCRIPT

I HAVE no wish to stir the still-smouldering embers of dispute over the players' play in *Hamlet*, but candour demands that I should draw attention to one point that has become plain to me in the course of the discussion, namely that there is a rather obvious logical oversight in the article in which I originally put forward my revolutionary theory twenty-two years ago. I do not think that any of my various critics has pointed out this particular error, but though it does not prove my conclusion wrong I am bound to admit that it makes it uncertain. I think my eyes were first opened while reading Mr Granville Barker's fascinating *Preface*, while a recent article on 'Hamlet and the Mouse-Trap' (*PMLA*, Sept. 1939, LIV, 709-35), in which Dr W. W. Lawrence once again attacks the problem, affords me an opportunity for explanation.

The orthodox interpretation of the action, of course, is that the King gives himself away on seeing his crime re-enacted on the stage. The objection to this view that I pointed out is that the same events have already been represented in even greater detail in the dumb-show, and that the King showed no sign of recognizing them; whence I drew the conclusion that the play did *not* reproduce the circumstances of his crime (his subsequent behaviour being due to other causes) and that the Ghost's revelation was therefore not true.

The most usual suggestion for evading the difficulty raised by the dumb-show is what has come to be known as the 'second tooth' theory. One may brace oneself to endure the pain of one extraction and yet flinch from a repetition. Now, I agree with Professor Dover Wilson in rejecting this argument: it is mere bad psychology, the two cases are not parallel. The point of the Mouse-Trap is that the sudden and unexpected shock of the disclosure shall cause the King to betray his guilt. if he withstands one shock he will be less, not more, likely to give himself away on a repetition. Of this I am absolutely convinced. And I further agree with Professor Wilson in believing that the dumb-show was no part of Hamlet's plan and came to him indeed as a most unwelcome surprise. It risked springing the trap prematurely and warning the victim.

Professor Wilson's own way out of the dilemma is to suppose that the King did not see the dumb-show, being wholly absorbed in private talk with the Queen and Polonius. This I am, like Dr Lawrence, quite unable to believe, and I need add nothing to what he has said on the subject.

But, it is argued, though the King sat unmoved through the dumb-show, he undoubtedly did break off the performance 'upon the talk of the poisoning'. Did he not then give himself away, as Hamlet declares? This, as I sought to show, is a misconception of the scene: what leads to the break-up of the assembly is not the King's guilty conscience but Hamlet's outrageous behaviour. No unprejudiced spectator assumes any other cause. The whole attitude of the court makes it clear that the King gave no indication of being caught in the trap—at least no outward indication. I am delighted to find myself in this completely at one with Dr Lawrence, and I am as convinced as he is that Professor Wilson's vision of the King 'tottering' from the room like a 'blinking paddock', 'squealing for light', is just a figment of his imagination.

From these data I drew, in my original article of 1917, what was, I still believe, a perfectly reasonable conclusion, namely that the circumstances of the death of the elder Hamlet were not those represented in 'The Murder of Gonzago'. But had I paused at this point to reconsider the evidence, I might have perceived that it was open to an alternative interpretation. That the King did not openly betray himself 'upon the talk of the poisoning' is not of itself proof that the picture presented to him was not a true one; and if he was able to endure the spectacle presented in the play itself without flinching, he may equally have been able to endure the dumb-show. In fact it may just have been the warning conveyed by the latter that enabled him to steel himself to the endurance of the former; while Hamlet's behaviour gave him just the excuse he needed for breaking off what must, in any case, have been a very galling scene. The evidence is therefore not *necessarily* inconsistent with the truth of the Ghost's revelation.

I should explain that, while I am generally in agreement with Dr Lawrence's reading of Claudius's behaviour, he believes that the King does give himself away to the watchful eyes of Hamlet and Horatio, *both* during the dumb-show *and* at the climax of the play. This I now agree is a *possible* interpretation: I do not think it is a *necessary* one. That he did so during the dumb-show I can see no indication whatever; and I do not believe it, since I think that it was his failure to do so that explains Hamlet's behaviour. That Hamlet believed him to have done so at the climax is obvious, and he receives some confirmation from Horatio. But Hamlet's evidence is completely unreliable, while the support he receives from Horatio is curiously ambiguous. Either interpretation is possible.

The position that emerges is this. According to the traditional interpretation the King's behaviour proves the truth of the Ghost's revelation.

According to my original contention it disproves it. Actually it does neither. Readers who recall that brilliantly ingenious play, *Ten Minute Alibi*, will be amused by the parallel afforded by the climax of the police investigation. The detectives decide to put what they conceive to be a crucial test-question to the suspect. Without thinking, he gives the true answer, and is immediately convinced that he has betrayed his guilt. The police, on the contrary, believe that he has established his innocence. In fact, the question is entirely irrelevant!

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

'VOLPONE' AND THE REPUTATION OF VENETIAN JUSTICE

MISS VIOLET M. JEFFERY, in 'Shakespeare's Venice', notices the topographical realism which Shakespeare confers on the source materials of *The Merchant of Venice* and *Othello*.¹ She suggests that perhaps Shakespeare was 'drawing upon his own knowledge of the city to complete the picture'.² The topographical touches which she points out are characteristic of the comedy of realism, of which *Volpone* is a good example, rather than of romantic comedy,³ with Shakespeare, however, this Venetian local colour reflects the surprising Elizabethan interest in the Italian mercantile metropolis. As Miss Jeffery observes of *The Merchant of Venice*: 'Under Shakespeare's pen, Venice the great state, small in territory, mighty in spirit and in compass, rears herself up and dominates the play.'⁴ This particular interest in Venice goes beyond topography, and at least one aspect of *The Merchant of Venice* probably has a direct influence on Jonson's *Volpone*.

Herford and Simpson comment on Jonson's choice of Venice as the locale for *Volpone*:

Jonson therefore took a most politic step in transferring his *mise en scène* from ancient Rome—already of ill augury for the audiences of *Poetaster* and *Sejanus*—to modern Italy. For the Jacobean Italy was the classic contemporary land of sensational evil-doing. Among Italian cities Venice, with Florence as the city of Machiavel, stood in the front rank for this sinister repute. Shylock was but one, and hardly the most consummate, of those whom the stage had shown plotting monstrous things by the Rialto. To make the Fox a Venetian grandee was thus to give him and his story the best chance of being at once piquant and plausible.⁵

But this is only half of the dramatic problem: the daring schemes and the amazing dénouement of *Volpone* called not only for a locale where the plotting of monstrous things would seem plausible, but also for one where flourished, in popular knowledge, an autonomous judicial system sufficiently severe and righteous to frustrate and to punish the villainy its society presumably tolerated. The locale specifically had to provide the dramatist with a legal code disinterested enough to make the punishment of the patrician *Volpone* plausible, and rigorous enough to be

¹ 'Shakespeare's Venice', *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxvii, 24-35.

² *Ibid.*, p. 28.

³ See my article on 'Topographical comedy in the seventeenth century', *English Literary History*, iii, 270-90.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 28.

⁵ *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, ii, 53-4. References here will be to this edition.

identifiable with Jonson's own stern moral sense. Jonson's choice of Venice probably was immediately influenced by *The Merchant of Venice* and by Lewis Lewkenor's translation of Cardinal Gasparo Contarini's *De Magistratibus et Republica Venetorum*. Venice at this time was singly notable not only for its 'sinister repute', but also for the integrity and severity of its republican courts.

Discussing the dramatic use of trial scenes, Creizenach writes: 'The proceedings before the Doge which form the climax of *The Merchant of Venice* furnish us with the most famous example of this type, which Ben Jonson afterwards developed with such surprising effect in *Volpone*.'¹ The climactic nature of both scenes is made possible not merely by plots based upon a bond and a will but by the strictly judicial function of the tribunals as well. The law of Venice alone is allowed to determine the outcome of both comedies.² The usurer Shylock, pointing to his bond, challenges the Doge:

If you deny it, let the danger light
Upon your charter and your city's freedom.

If you deny me, fie upon your law!
There is no force in the decrees of Venice.

(IV, 1, 38-9, 101-2).

Salerio describes him previously:

He plies the duke at morning and at night,
And doth impeach the freedom of the state,
If they deny him justice....

(III, ii, 280-2).

Though Shakespeare did not himself make Jonson's choice of Venice, he is not unaware of the reputation of its law, the peculiar inexorableness of which he has the merchant explain:

The duke cannot deny the course of law:
For the commodity that strangers have
With us in Venice, if it be denied,
Will much impeach the justice of his state;
Since that the trade and profit of the city
Consisteth of all nations.

(III, iii, 26-31).

The city's well-being, then, depends upon the international respect for its equity. If there is in these statements a confusion of Venetian with British terms, it is hardly evidence for double authorship, as Professor Wilson suggests, but rather of Shakespeare's endeavour to show his Elizabethan audience that Venetian law could afford protection even to

¹ W. Creizenach, *The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*, London, 1916, p. 267.

² In neither of Webster's great trial scenes, in *The White Devil* and *The Devil's Law Case*, does the law resolve the plot.

Jewish usurers.¹ A dichotomy, inevitable in the medieval story of a fairy-tale bond and a historical and specific tribunal, does appear when, after adverting to the realistic reputation of Venetian law, Shakespeare permits his court to have recourse to a quibble reminiscent of decadent scholasticism.² But the sentiments of his audience about Jewish usurers, and specifically about Shylock, enable Shakespeare to extricate himself from this incongruous position and even doubtless notably to strengthen the popular confidence in Venetian jurisprudence.³ To-day, however, the emphasis placed upon the reputation and the judicial procedure of a renaissance state in the solution of the fanciful bond plot certainly contributes much to the impression that Shylock is a tragic character, persecuted by organized society.

Though Shakespeare's comedy, in which Shylock's criminal passion is frustrated by Venetian law, antedates *Volpone*, 1606, by perhaps ten years, it was first printed in 1600, and in February 1605 it was revived for two recorded performances at court.⁴ Jonson was at liberty to select any locale for the career of the classical *captator*, but the unfamiliarity of the type and his concern for probability must have influenced his choice. As Herford and Simpson suggest, for contemporary England Italy afforded the proper milieu for the fantastically sinister, but *Volpone* needed also a locale where such indigenous forces might be checked and subjected to the severity of a Jonsonian moral judgement. Fresh from his work on *Sejanus*, Jonson does not create some high-minded prince, like Browning's Pope in *The Ring and the Book*, as the dispenser of his justice; instead, he employs the republican system of Venice.⁵ Samuel Lewkenor, in his *A Discourse not altogether unprofitable, nor unpleasant for such as are desirous to know the situation and customes of forraigne Cities without traueilling to see them*, 1600, interprets the arbitrary and singular character of Venetian jurisprudence:

They use not as in other places the ciuill law, but liue and are gouerned by their own

¹ *The Merchant of Venice*, ed. J. D. Wilson, pp. 113-14. Shakespeare exchanges Bologna of his sources for Padua, in Venetian territory and seat of a university famous for the study of civil law, but exigencies of time might also explain this substitution, III, iv, 49, iv, i, 109, 119.

² See Josef Kohler, *Shakespeare vor dem Forum der Jurisprudenz*, Berlin, 1919, pp. 3-10.

³ See E. E. Stoll, *Shakespeare Studies*, New York, 1927, pp. 255-336, J. W. Draper, 'Usury in *The Merchant of Venice*', *Modern Philology*, XXXIII, 37-47.

⁴ See E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, I, 373, II, 332; Herford and Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, II, 49, n. 1. Cf. W. W. Greg, 'Notes on Ben Jonson's Works', *Rev. English Stud.*, II, 138-9.

⁵ Perhaps Jonson is carrying over some of the political sentiments of his Roman play. The integrity of Venice interested contemporary England because of the controversy with Pope Paul V. Father Sarpi's *A Fair and Satisfactory Answer* was printed at London in 1606.

14 'Volpone' and the Reputation of Venetian Justice

lawes and peculiar course of iustice, which liberty was as *Blondus* writeth, first granted thē by *Charles* the great, the high Bishop of *Rome* thereto giuing his assent.¹

The fierceness of the justice meted out in the last scene in *Volpone*, as crushing as the imperial edict in *Sejanus*, presupposes certainly a popular faith in the authority of the republic's institutions.

After Shakespeare's play, very probably the *De Magistratibus et Republica Venetorum* of Gasparo Contarini, which Sir Politic Would-be mentions as a compendium of information about Venice, was a factor that affected Jonson's choice of locale. Sir Politic Would-be confides to Peregrine:

Within the first weeke, of my landing here,
All tooke me for a citizen of *Venice*:
I knew the forms, so well— PER. And nothing else.
POL. I had read CONTARENE, tooke me a house,
Dealt with my *Iewes*, to furnish it with moueables—

(IV, 1, 37-41).

Like Jean Bodin's *Les Six Livres de la Republique*, 1579, which Sir Politic also knew, Contarini's book held up the state as a work of art.² First printed in 1524, in 1599 Lewis Lewkenor published his translation from an Italian version as *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice*. Thomas Coryat, in the dedicatory epistle to his *Crudities*, provides a sound estimation of the contemporary position of Lewkenor's translation; he anticipates a critic of his own lengthy description of Venice:

For we haue the historie of Venice (he will perhaps say) already translated out of Italian into English. Therefore what neede we more descriptions of that Citie? Truly I confesse that Cardinall Contarens Commonwealth of Venice hath been so elegantly translated into English, that any iudicious Reader may by the reading thereof much instruct himselfe with the forme of the Venetian government. But that booke reporteth not halfe so many remarkable matters as mine doth (*absit dicto invidia*) of the antiquities and monuments of that famous Citie, etc.³

Contarini's work deals, of course, with the whole Venetian state, but the sonnet Edmund Spenser wrote for Lewkenor's translation obtains its climax in the praise of the republic's justice; after the ancient and the second Babel,

Fayre *Venice*, flower of the last worlds delight
And next to them in beauty draweth neare,
And far exceeds in policie of right.

This is rather a significant commendation from the poet whose epic is based on the twelve moral virtues according to Aristotle, one of which

¹ P. 30v.

² *Volpone*, IV, 1, 26. Richard Knolles's translation of Bodin, *The Six Bookes of a Commonwealth*, entered for Islip on 8 Jan. 1603, was published in 1606. For 'The State as a Work of Art', see Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S. G. C. Middlemore, Part I.

³ *Coryat's Crudities*, Glasgow, 1905, I, 2-3. Lewis Lewkenor is the contributor of a prefatory poem, pp. 27-8. Coryat went to Venice in 1608 and printed his work three years later.

is Justice.¹ A similar note is struck in a Latin dialogue cited by Coryat which, referring the notable characteristics of Venice to the munificence of the gods, ascribes its jurisprudence to Minerva.² Though Sir Henry Wotton, the ambassador to Venice, frequently used his influence to mitigate the severity of Venetian law, he reports to Sir Thomas Edmondes, on 23 December 1605, that 'The State is quiet, rather through good laws than good dispositions'.³

Besides taking advantage of the general reputation of the Venetian state and its courts, which was probably greatly enhanced by Lewkenor's translation, Jonson may be indebted to Contarini's work itself as a basis for the judicial procedure in *Volpone*. The large differences between *The Merchant of Venice* and *Volpone* in this respect may certainly be referred to the information in this treatise. Jonson, who had just challenged Shakespeare's want of learning in *Julius Caesar* with his *Sejanus*, defers to realistic Venetian legal practice and does not use the doge as a magistrate in *Volpone*,⁴ instead four Avocatori act, first as examiners or prosecutors, and then as a judicial body. For the former capacities of the Avocatori Contarini may be cited, but when they appear as a whole court, Jonson perhaps sacrifices fact for dramatic effect.

Contarini discusses the Venetian courts and the advocates, as Lewkenor calls them, in the third book of his treatise. Of these advocates he writes:

...the duty and function thereof being to defend the lawes pure and uniolate, without suffering them in any one point to be blemished, so that their authority and power is much like vnto that of the Tribunes of the Romaine people, but that they were to defend the liberty of the people, and ours onely the force of the lawes...⁵

As prosecutors they 'pleaded and made report vnto the. .xl. men for small causes, for greater to the Senate, for greatest of all to the greater Councell, if so they shall think good...'.⁶ Before the college of forty, which arrived at a verdict by balloting, they were expected 'to behaue themselves with great sharpnesse, vehemence and seuerity...'.⁷ They

¹ Lewkenor's dedication to the Countess of Warwick, who shares the dedication of Spenser's *Four Hymns*, 1596, is dated 13 Aug. 1598; the translation might have been in circulation when Spenser was in London in 1595-6, since Sir John Harrington elsewhere dates his prefatory poem 1595; *The Letters and Epigrams of Sir John Harrington*, ed. N. E. McClure, Philadelphia, 1930, p. 240.

² *Op. cit.*, I, 302.

³ *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, ed. L. P. Smith, Oxford, 1907, I, 67-9, 331.

⁴ See Herford and Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, II, 9-10. Both *The Merchant of Venice* and *Volpone* were acted by the King's Men in 1605 and 1606. Of the doge as a magistrate, Contarini writes, in Lewkenor's translation: 'For so great is the princes authoritie, that he may in whatsoever court adioine himself to the Magistrate therein, being president as his colleague or companion, and haue equall power with other Presidents, that he might so by this meanes be able to looke into all things' (p. 41).

⁵ P. 85.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ P. 87; see also p. 91.

had jurisdiction over capital, as opposed to civil, causes; this category was determined by the status of the offender and by the gravity of the offence, and included the punishment of 'lewd & wicked men, that... trespasse. wickedly against any citizen, or member thereof in particular...'.¹

Bonario and Celia therefore denounce Volpone to the Avocatori, and to circumvent them the lawyer Voltore orders Mosca to bring Corvino to the Scrutineo, or Senate-house (III, ix, 55). On the way Mosca meets Lady Would-be, who exclaims:

If the *Senate*
Right not my quest, in this; I will protest 'hem,
To all the world, no *aristocracie*.

(IV, III, 1-3).

After an inquiry, Mosca is able to mislead her into becoming a witness against Celia

the creature
I mention'd to you, is apprehended, now,
Before the *Senate*, you shall see her—

(IV, III, 6-8).

At Act IV, v, the four Avocatori (Jonson seems responsible for the number), having heard Bonario and Celia, enter conversing:

The like of this the *Senate* neuer heard of.

Avoc. 2. 'Twill come most strange to them, when we report it.²

Thus far Jonson, following Contarini, seems to promise a prosecution by the Avocatori before the Senate which decided cases of a graver nature. But now, when the Avocatori begin to hear Voltore's defence of the accused conspirators who have been cited to appear (IV, iv, 11), the Senate is forgotten and they themselves, in spite of title and duty, assume the function of a whole court. The inquiry concludes with the imprisonment of Bonario and Celia; Volpone is commended and informed that ere night he shall hear 'What punishment the court decrees vpon 'hem'.³ The only warrant in Contarini for Jonson's use of the Avocatori as a court is rather tenuous:

...though of themselves they have not any authority of determining any thing absolutely against the offenders, vnless it be in some small causes: the rest are all ordered by the sentence of the Councill.⁴

¹ P. 84.

² IV, v, 1-2 Contarini writes that 'all other great and waightie crimes, being by the Aduocators reported of, and by the Colledge of fortie well pondered and debated, are wont all to be determined, and punished according to the qualitie of the crime...' (p. 84). Discussing the procedure (pp. 85-9), he seems to indicate that three advocates was normally the number acting together. Modern editors follow Gifford in placing this and subsequent court scenes at the Senate-house

³ IV, vi, 61-2.

⁴ Pp. 85-6.

Corbaccio opens Act v, vi, by remarking, 'They say, the court is set.' At Act v, x, the four Avocatori appear to pronounce sentence; the verdict which is finally enforced, however, is not against Bonario and Celia, but against Volpone and the conspirators. The patrician magnifico is condemned without standing trial before the forty, the Senate, or the greater Council. Jonson seems to have been aware of the true function of the advocates and of the Senate; his reputation for painstaking verisimilitude and the ready availability of Lewkenor's translation practically obviate the possibility of carelessness or a lapse of memory. The sudden and original turn the conduct of the trial receives was probably dictated by the exigencies of drama—and perhaps of the stage as well. Certainly Jonson recognized that the pleading and the balloting which Contarini describes as the peculiar procedure of a trial by the advocates before the forty or the Senate, though essential to Venetian democracy, would only have slowed down the rapidly increasing momentum of his action. He foregoes, therefore, the spectacle of a scene which would have encumbered rather than strengthened the swift ruthlessness of the moral judgement which is his chief concern: his sense of theatrical effectiveness here restricts the learned realism to which he is supposedly committed. The sentence, however, is certainly in keeping with the severity of character which the advocates were advised to preserve: 'Alwaies the Aduocators doe propounde that punishment which to that sorte of offence doth seeme most sharpe and grieuous, their office and duty being more to incline to seuerity than to mercie.'¹ With such an uncompromising attitude the lawyer Voltore seems acquainted:

O, my most honour'd fathers, let your mercy
Once winne vpon your iustice, to forgiue— (v, x, 3-4).

It is not impossible that Jonson may be indebted to Lewkenor's volume for other information about Venice. Volpone, for example, in the mountebank scene, refers to 'the depositions of those that appear'd on my part, before the signiory of the Sanità, and most learned colledge of physitiens'.² In an appendix drawn from Girolamo Bardi, Lewkenor writes of the 'Signeori alla Sanita' that 'they have authority to giue licence to phisicians to practise, and to Mountebanks, & Chiurlatanes to go vp and down the countrey, and to preach in the markets. .'.³

¹ P. 91.

² II, II, 139-41. The pleonasm is explanatory.

³ P. 182. As J. D. Rea suggests, the generally rather accurate local colour in *Volpone* Jonson might have obtained from acquaintances like Florio; *Volpone*, ed. J. D. Rea, New Haven, 1919, p. xxx. He does not notice the use of the Avocatori. Lewkenor's appendices provide information on the Incurabili (v, xii, 120), San' Spirito (v, xii, 131; cf. *Life and Letters of Wotton*, I, 51; II, 216), and on the entertainment of Henry III (III, vii, 159-64); see Lewkenor, pp. 189, 188, 228-30 (note that there occurs here also a reference to Actum and to Antony whom Volpone says he impersonated).

18 'Volpone' and the Reputation of Venetian Justice

By his choice of Venice, then, Jonson is able to capitalize upon the customary Elizabethan idea of Italy as a land of lawless and criminal passions, and to utilize in his overwhelming dénouement the reputation of the Venetian courts. He draws a picture of a society decadent morally, yet subjected to a rigorous judicial code. Jonson is aware of this antinomy when he has Sir Politic cite Machiavelli for the rules of behaviour in Venice:

And then, for your religion, professe none;
But wonder, at the diuersity of all;
And, for your part, protest, were there no other
But simply the lawes o' th' land, you could content you:
NIC: MACHIAVEL, and monsieur BODINE, both,
Were of this minde.

(iv, 1, 22-7).

The state might well be a work of art, as Machiavelli, Bodin, and Contarini indeed suggest, but Italian society in the Venice of Aretino remains for Jonson essentially what it was popularly, and with some reason, supposed to be.¹ The collision of these two forces, of Italian renaissance state and society, gives *Volpone* its superb climax. For this conclusion the use of Venice as a locale was almost inevitable.

RICHARD H. PERKINSON.

NEW YORK.

¹ See Burckhardt, *Civilization of the Renaissance*, Part VI, Chapter I.

THE EVOLUTION OF RACINE'S 'POÉTIQUE'

RACINE's dramatic career has never been examined in a full-length study making proper use of recent work on his period. Corneille and Molière have been reinterpreted in this way. Our view of Racine is changing too. he is no longer, as he was to most of the nineteenth century, an amiable but unhappy example of the application of an unnatural system of rules, but the opposite tendency still exists, at least in France, of contemplating him *in vacuo*, erecting his rules into a far more absolute and restricting edifice than they ever were, and loading the poet with hyperbolic praise as the embodiment of extremes of *nudité* and *abstraction* of which he never dreamed. Put back among his contemporaries, he would show as a man who studied and imitated them, but with discrimination and originality.

His theory and practice were neither of them static, and their course could and should be charted with reference to the landmarks which surrounded it. A host of monographs has cleared the ground, and the monumental *History* of Professor H. Carrington Lancaster¹ is combining the results obtained. He has given to Corneille's period possibly its definitive treatment, and his forthcoming volumes will extend the same method to that of Racine's masterpieces, amplifying the highly important indications already available in M. D. Mornet's edition of the poet.²

The theoretical bases of 'classicism' have been dealt with admirably by M. R. Bray.³ So far as I know, however, the specific subject of Racine's own aesthetic principles has not been recently attempted (Robert's thesis,⁴ now out of date, was concerned with the same generalities that Bray has treated with far greater detail and knowledge). His prefaces, especially as compared with Corneille's, too easily appear mere *plandoyers*—often disingenuous—applying received doctrine to silence his own critics. This study will attempt to use them afresh, together with all other relevant material, to show what ideas he had consciously formulated about his art, and what influences helped him to arrive at them.

¹ *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*, Baltimore, 1929- .

² Racine, *Théâtre* (Les Grands Auteurs Français), Paris, Mellottée, n.d.

³ *La Formation de la Doctrine Classique en France*, Paris, 1927.

⁴ *La Poétique de Racine*, Paris, 1890. When I wrote this paragraph I had not seen Sister M. P. Haley's interesting *Racine and the 'Art Poétique' of Boileau*, Baltimore, 1938, which summarizes the theoretical utterances of the Prefaces. The author promises a second work 'in which the dramatist's technique is being studied in each successive tragedy'.

I shall take up a fairly old theory, revived and reshaped in a recent work on Quinault, which explains the later part of Racine's career by the animosity he conceived on literary grounds against this competitor, and shall attempt to use it to throw light on earlier periods of his life. We know Racine to have been a merciless critic of others; we know him to have been keenly susceptible to criticism made against himself, and may presume him to have been deeply galled, as was Boileau, whenever a tendency he condemned won its way into popular favour: all the more, surely, when this tendency came into direct competition with his own work. I shall take a further step and suggest that on three occasions when this occurred the effect was to confirm him in his own belief and make him apply it even more resolutely in his work; and that these antipathies had an extremely strong influence, in a negative direction, on the formation of his *poétique*.

This hypothesis, if accepted, enriches our knowledge of Racine's character, and at the same time shows a new guiding principle at work in the evolution of his art.

I. GILBERT AND THE TREATMENT OF ANTIQUITY

When Racine's correspondence first permits us to catch sight of him—it is the period of his poetical débuts—he is under various second-rate influences, literary and personal, which leave no lasting trace and rapidly disappear.

His letters of 1660–2, though they show evidence of a good deal of Latin reading, quote Ariosto far more often than any other author. Ovid gave him the subject of his first (apparently) and of his second attempt at a play.¹ His cousin Nicolas Vitart is taking an interest in his plans; so is his earliest Aristarchus, the amorous and, I fear, precious abbé Le Vasseur, who later became, as his sole title to fame, a member of the Academy of Soissons.² His first recorded service is to teach Racine the rules of the sonnet, the most pestilential of the 'lyrical' genres of the time, a kind of literary wild oats which a poet had to sow. The abbé did not, it seems, set up to be a poet himself,³ but he must have encouraged the frigid or witty insignificance of Racine's first manner, as we see it in the surviving poems and the letters of these years. The acquaintance of La Fontaine, the only man of merit among these early friends, had no discernible effect.

¹ *Amasie*, 1660, *Les Amours d'Ovide* (?), 1661; v. *Œuvres* (Grands Écrivains Français), vi, letters 4 (and note 4), 11.

² *Œuvres*, i, 32; vi, letters 2, 4, etc.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, letter 8.

One almost forgotten contact has much greater importance, since I believe it to be the first case of these progresses by repulsion which I am trying to record. There is evidence, which biographers of Racine have not yet noticed, to suggest that in 1661-3 he had his attention forcibly called to the existence of Gabriel Gilbert, a living dramatist of considerable production but small reputation.

Racine's second project was a play (in progress June 1661) concerned with the life of Ovid, and his third (if we can believe L. Racine, who ascribes this work to the Uzès visit, 1661-3) was *Théagène et Chariclée*. Gilbert had a *Théagène* performed in July 1662, and *Les Amours d'Ovide* in June 1663.¹

The simultaneous production of plays on the same subject and with the same title was quite common, and usually meant deliberate competition.² Certainly this double coincidence in the space of two years cannot be accidental.

Miss Pellet, Gilbert's biographer, has given part of the explanation. As she reminds us, we know from a letter of Racine³ that la BeauchastEAU, an actress of the Hôtel de Bourgogne, had given him suggestions for a play about Ovid (the editor of the 1807 edition of Racine even says, conceivably on the authority of some family papers, that it was to be called *Les Amours d'Ovide*), and that he was going carefully into the subject: 'J'ai fait, refait et mis enfin dans sa dernière perfection tout mon dessein... J'ai lu et marqué tous les ouvrages de mon héros, et j'ai commencé même quelques vers.'

Perhaps this labour took too long to please the Hôtel; perhaps he tired of the scheme. Now Gilbert was an old acquaintance of la BeauchastEAU—in 1657 he had a hand in preparing a collection of the *juvenilia* of her precocious son—and the suggestion is that the idea of the play on Ovid was given to him after Racine had let her down. His *Amours d'Ovide*, produced at the Hôtel, was a *pastorale héroïque* with a *deus ex machinâ*, Amour, descending on wires to unite the good lovers in act v; it owes little to Ovid and nothing to the facts of his life; its plot, style and sentimental tone derive obviously from the *Astrée*.⁴

How are we now to explain the two *Théagène*?

¹ Eleanor Pellet, *A forgotten French dramatist, Gabriel Gilbert*, Baltimore and Paris, 1930, pp. 166-7, 250-1.

² Cf. G. Michaut, *La Bérénice de Racine*, Paris, 1907, II, ch. v and App. A.

³ Pellet, *op. cit.*, and Racine, *Œuvres*, VI, letter 11. Professor Lancaster has tried (*op. cit.*, III, p. 375) to upset this account by transferring to 1663 Racine's letter, which seems quite securely dated, and by what seems a quite erroneous interpretation of the allusions it contains to his subject-matter.

⁴ Lancaster, *op. cit.*, *ibid.*

The date of Racine's is uncertain. For its ascription to the Uzès period we have only L. Racine's word, notoriously untrustworthy on precisely this matter of dating his father's *inédits*. The, on the whole unacceptable, tradition¹ that Racine wrote *La Thébaïde* in six weeks on a plan of Molière's, adds that Racine had offered Molière *Théagène* just over six months before, i.e. in the late autumn of 1663.

If it is accepted that Gilbert's *Théagène* of 1662 preceded Racine's, may we not think that Racine, knowing or hearing of it (he was in Uzès when it was produced), had the idea of paying off old scores by taking a subject of his rival's? Theagenes, like Ovid, was a theme familiar to Racine. We recall the pretty if incredible story of the two copies of Heliodorus burnt by Lancelot.

We cannot doubt his disapproval of the way Gilbert treated the Ovid theme. Even if Racine started *Théagène* before he could know what this was going to be, he had Gilbert's past works to judge by. As a keen theatre-lover he must have known of them; indeed, later on two of Gilbert's plays influence *Britannicus* and *Phèdre* respectively.

Gilbert did not believe, as Racine on the showing of the letter already quoted did believe, that a playwright's duty is to respect the historical facts and atmosphere of the epoch he purports to represent.

I shall show how large this idea later bulked in the mind of Racine. It was one of the rules of his art. Boileau was not the inventor of the precept

Des siècles, des pays étudiez les mœurs.

Aristotle had recommended that characters should be 'like the reality'; Horace warns us

Intererit multum divusne loquatur an heros,

.

Colchus an Assyrius, Thebis nutritus an Argis.

It was a part of *la bienséance*, which was 'non pas ce qui est honnête, mais ce qui convient aux personnes. . . telles qu'on les introduit dans la pièce'²—or to use the more developed classification³ it was *la bienséance interne*, as opposed to *la bienséance externe*, or conformity with the beliefs and manners of the audience. At this time however *la bienséance interne* was out of fashion, and *la bienséance externe*, which is in practice the negation of the other, was alone observed by all playwrights—except Corneille, whose popularity was over.

¹ *Œuvres*, I, Notice to *La Thébaïde*, pp. 379 ff.

² Chapelain, *Opuscules Critiques*, ed. Hunter, 'De la poésie représentative', p. 130.

³ Bray, *op. cit.*, III, ch. II, pp. 215 ff.

Racine was a scholar—and already beginning to be a good Greek scholar, a relatively rare thing—and knew his ancient authors.

But so was Gilbert. He claimed, and I think showed, knowledge of Hebrew;¹ so presumably he knew the more frequently mastered tongues, Latin and Greek. In one of his plays, *Hypolite*, he had made use of Euripides. He knew well enough what he was representing; but throughout his career he had bowed to the taste of the salons for which he wrote, and consistently misrepresented antiquity.

There is no need to bring up against him his *tragi-comédies* in which, like everybody else, he had rendered his sources completely unrecognizable in his search for the stock situations and effects (identity tangles, disguises, romantic imbroglios) on which alone the genre relied. But he had written more recently several tragedies based on ancient history or legend, conspicuous for the same faults.

He had brought out a *Rodogune* in competition with Corneille's, which comparison has shown to be a glaring piracy. Corneille exhibited chapter and verse for his characters and his dénouement: Gilbert located his neither in time nor in place, and gave the title-name to the wrong person. An *Hypolite*, of about the same date, though it followed two French plays on the subject, was more original, and has the honour of being the first to remove the incest-motive for reasons of false delicacy, and so destroy the plot: his Phèdre is unmarried and therefore free, and Hypolite, secretly in love with her, dies as the result of a miserable *quidproquo* in which Phèdre is not even involved.²

I suggest then that Racine, knowing his Ovidian subject to have been stolen and expecting it to be travestied by Gilbert, whose practice was in direct opposition to his own convictions, conceived the idea of taking a recent subject of Gilbert's, *Théagène*, and showing how it ought to be treated, in a spirit of jealous indignation such as we shall see again as a recurrent trait in his character.

Meagre as the surviving evidence is, this interpretation is surely not fantastic. Two men, living in the same circle, each produce two plays on the same two subjects within two years. Coincidence in such a case must be excluded. They do so then in emulation, friendly or otherwise. If any scholar prefers to think of Racine as Gilbert's friend, or admirer, nothing prevents him. My suggestion fits in better, I submit, with our idea of

¹ In his *Pseaumes*, Paris, 1680: v. préface.

² In all my remarks on plays concerning Phaedra I am much indebted to Miss Winifred Newton's study, *Le thème de Phèdre et d'Hippolyte dans la Littérature française*, Paris, 1939. Gilbert's *Arne et Pétus* (1659) is nearer the Cornelian type, and is thought to have influenced *Britannicus*.

Racine's character and opinions, and our knowledge of other episodes in his life.

I further suggest that this brush with Gilbert must have had on Racine a positive effect, that of strengthening and making conscious in him, *par esprit de contradiction*, that principle of respect for the historical or legendary data which is prominent in every one of his prefaces.

We must investigate a few more personal and literary influences of transient and doubtful importance before we recover our main thread with the second major encounter of Racine's life.

His exile in the Midi for two or more years had produced no visible change in his taste. Among much sacred and frivolous reading he studied Pindar, who left him cold, and Homer, who impressed him; but the simplicity for which he admired Homer he never thought it possible to imitate in French poetry. The only outcome, so far, of his interest in Greece was disappointing: in his third attempt at play-writing he took, as we have seen, the subject of an Alexandrian romance.

His earliest completed plays have ancient subjects, but this was common contemporary practice. They are in fact conspicuous for their indebtedness to modern influences.

Rotrou¹ inspires *La Thébaine*. *Alexandre* reflects Quinault and Thomas Corneille. *Andromaque* continues the love-interest in which the two latter specialized, but by basing it on an original and realistic psychology it discovers one of the great *ressorts* of Racine's dramatic art—so much so that the trio of lovers ends by pushing off the stage the unpassionate heroine who holds the title-rôle.

But we must go back to Racine's return to Paris in 1662 or 1663 to consider two acquaintanceships on which in the past too much stress has been laid.

Boileau (at this time) and Molière were not his close personal friends. Neither they, nor Racine himself, were members of the *société des quatre amis de Psyché*.² Molière produced Racine's first two plays, and during rehearsals may have talked theatre and poetry with the beginner. It seems that they were personally as well as professionally acquainted, but how closely it is impossible to say. There might be some truth behind the unacceptable legend that Molière helped him with the *Thébaïde*:³

¹ 'Rotrou, dont Monsieur Racine m'avait toujours parlé avec éloge, et dont il n'avait pas dédaigné de s'approprier souvent des lambeaux' (La Grange-Chancel, *Théâtre*, 1746, préface). He possessed his collected works.

² J. Demeure, *RHLLF*, avril-juin, 1929.

³ V. p. 22, note 1.

but Molière was a poor tragic actor and rather despised the genre,¹ and Racine showed his opinion of him by taking *Alexandre* to his rivals of the Hôtel. One lesson Molière could have taught Racine at this time was the hatred of preciosity; the *scène du sonnet* was played in 1666, but Pyrrhus in the following year had not altogether taken it to heart.

In 1664, if not earlier, Racine is supposed to have met Boileau. They were possibly fellow-guests at the Hôtel de Nevers in 1665;² but, as M. J. Demeure has shown,³ Boileau himself dated their intimacy from 1671, and the stories of various pieces of advice given to Racine before then do not carry conviction. It may be doubted if Boileau, though Racine and he certainly consulted each other over questions of diction, e.g. in 1693 and 1694,⁴ ever had any suggestions of value to offer over dramatic problems properly speaking.

II. CORNEILLE: HISTORY AND SIMPLICITY

In 1666 *Alexandre* appeared in print with a preface, such as accompanies henceforth each of Racine's plays—the first document we have in which he discusses his own art. He speaks of his deference to *les avis sincères de mes véritables amis*, whoever they may have been, but he also takes care to show, true to the spirit of the time, that he has studied dramatic theory in the best authorities. He mentions Aristotle's *Poetics*, to which so many of his subsequent prefaces refer, and he gives a short synopsis of the accepted rules, probably derived from the two great critical works of the last decade—D'Aubignac's *Pratique du théâtre* (1657) and Corneille's three *Discours sur le poème dramatique* (1660).⁵

Je ne répons rien à ceux qui blâment Alexandre . . . C'est assez pour moi que ce qui passe pour une faute auprès de ces esprits qui n'ont lu l'histoire que dans les romans . . . a reçu des louanges . . . Enfin la plus importante objection que l'on me fasse, c'est que mon sujet est trop simple et trop stérile. Je ne représente point à ces critiques le goût de l'antiquité. Je vois bien qu'ils la connaissent médiocrement. Mais de quoi se plaignent-ils, si toutes mes scènes sont bien remplies, si elles sont liées nécessairement les unes avec les autres, si tous mes acteurs ne viennent point sur le théâtre que l'on ne sache la raison qui les y fait venir, et si, avec peu d'incidents et peu de matière, j'ai été assez heureux pour faire une pièce qui les a peut-être attachés malgré eux . . . ?

He appeals most strongly here in defence of his play to two principles, respect for history and *le goût de l'antiquité*, both set at naught, he says,

¹ *Critique de l'École des Femmes*, vi.

² *Œuvres*, i, *Alexandre*, Notice p. 497, but, as Sr. M. Haley points out (*op. cit.*, p. 17) 'Boileau' to the seventeenth century meant Gilles, not Nicolas.

³ 'Racine et son ennemi Boileau', *Mercur*, 1 juillet, 1928; v. also Sr. M. Haley, *op. cit.*, pt. i.

⁴ *Œuvres*, vii, letters 114, 131.

⁵ Racine owned and at some time annotated D'Aubignac—most unfavourably (*Œuvres*, vi, p. 351, ed. 1865); several of his MS. notes on the *Poetics* and the Attic tragedians (*ibid.* pp. 218 ff., 289; v, p. 477) seem to show familiarity with the *Discours* of Corneille.

by modern taste. The second is here a reference to simplicity of structure, of which we hear more five years later. The first point, which is precisely that by which in our eyes *Alexandre* stands condemned—and by which Saint-Evremond was to condemn it—recurs in the next preface, that of *Andromaque*.

Mais véritablement mes personnages sont si fameux dans l'antiquité, que pour peu qu'on la connaisse, on verra fort bien que je les ai rendus tels que les anciens poètes nous les ont donnés. Aussi n'ai-je pas pensé qu'il me fût permis de rien changer à leurs mœurs. Toute la liberté que j'ai prise, c'a été d'adoucir un peu la férocité de Pyrrhus...

Encore s'est-il trouvé des gens qui se sont plaints qu'il s'emportât contre *Andromaque*, et qu'il voulût épouser cette captive à quelque prix que ce fût. J'avoue qu'il n'est pas assez résigné à la volonté de sa maîtresse, et que Céladon a mieux connu que lui le parfait amour. Mais que faire? Pyrrhus n'avait pas lu nos romans...

I have suggested that it was the Gilbert episode which drew Racine's attention to this question, but his convictions had other sources, and had moreover been recently reinforced. Had not Saint-Evremond denied the historical pretensions of *Alexandre*, and ascribed to Corneille alone (re-applying Racine's own phrase) *le bon goût de l'antiquité*? Was not Corneille's treatment of history, not only his crowning glory, but an important plank in his dramatic theory?

Scudéry and the Academy had condemned the *Cid* for sacrificing *vraisemblance* to historical truth—including under *vraisemblance* that *bienséance* (*bienséance externe*, as defined above) which consisted in conformity with the audience's manners and ideas. D'Aubignac had blamed Valère, in the fifth act of *Horace*, for accusing Camille's murderer instead of challenging him, as a modern gallant would; and Corneille had replied:

S'il ne prend pas le procédé de France, il faut considérer qu'il est Romain et dans Rome, où il n'aurait pu entreprendre un duel contre un autre Romain sans faire un crime d'Etat, et que j'en aurais fait un de théâtre, si j'avais habillé un Romain à la française (*Examen*).

It was in defence against these attacks that Corneille had evolved his well-known theory that 'les grands sujets . . . doivent toujours aller au delà du vraisemblable' and must be true to history (or legend) to gain credence.¹ Racine did not carry his master's heresy so far, and never questioned the claims of *vraisemblance* ('Il n'y a que le vraisemblable qui touche dans la tragédie', *Bérénice*, préf.). But in these prefaces he borrows Corneille's ideas: against the same opposition, to wit the bad taste and ignorance of contemporaries, he erects, despite those who deny his right to appeal to it, the same principle of truth to historical (or

¹ *Premier Discours*, ad init.

legendary) fact—surreptitiously adjusted by the dramatist's own sense of fitness—or in the terms of his art, the other *bien-séance*, la *bien-séance interne*

The very form and typographical layout of the preface to *Andromaque* is similar to that of the *avant-propos* of the *Cid*, and of *Polyeucte*, and resembles that of *Rodogune* so remarkably that I quote parts of each for comparison.

Rodogune, avant-propos (there is no title):

APPIAN ALEXANDRIN

AU LIVRE DES GUERRES DE SYRIE

sur la fin

[Long extract in French.]

Voilà ce que m'a prêté l'histoire, où j'ai changé les circonstances de quelques incidents, pour leur donner plus de bien-séance.... L'ordre de leur naissance incertain, Rodogune prisonnière...., la haine de Cléopâtre pour elle,....ne sont que des embellissements de l'invention...Je l'ai même adouci [the horror of the dénouement] tant que j'ai pu en Antiochus...

Andromaque, préface (there is no title):

VIRGILE

AU TROISIÈME LIVRE DE L'ÉNÉIDE

C'est Enée qui parle

[Long extract in Latin.]

Voilà, en peu de vers, tout le sujet de cette tragédie. Voilà le lieu de la scène, l'action qui s'y passe, les quatre principaux acteurs, et même leurs caractères. Excepté celui d'Hermione, dont la jalousie et les emportements sont assez marqués dans l'*Andromaque* d'Euripide. . .Toute la liberté que j'ai prise, ç'a été d'adoucir un peu la férocité de Pyrrhus ..

I have called Corneille Racine's master, and Racine's relationship, at the start, was one of discipleship and not, I submit, of rivalry. *Alexandre* is said to have been submitted to Corneille for criticism.¹ Racine studied Corneille's plays, and from *La Thébaine*² onwards his own works contain frequent echoes of Corneille's. After *Andromaque* he turns, in imitation of Corneille, to subjects connected with Roman history, and he never ceases to harp on Corneille's principle of historical accuracy.

The 'Cornelian' nature of the subject of *Britannicus* may or may not have been, as the rival production of *Bérénice* certainly was, an act of hostility. But the war may equally well have been started by Corneille. Ageing and losing popularity, he clung to those who, like Saint-Evremond and Mme de Sévigné, remembered the glories of his past and would see no merit in a new style. Certainly he was unjust, and Racine may have been particularly piqued if he knew that Corneille was classing him³ among the *doucereux* from whom he was trying to distinguish himself—and who were attacking him on the other flank. A clash, in which each thought himself in the right, was imminent. If, as Racine says in the

¹ *Œuvres*, I. Notice to the play, p. 509 and note 1.

² E.g. vv. 206 ff. = *Pompée*, vv. 232 ff.; v. 268 = *Cid*, v. 285.

³ V. his letter to Saint-Evremond (not printed till 1725), *Œuvres* (Grands Écrivains), x, letter 29, p. 498

preface of *Britannicus*, Corneille came to that play and behaved with open enmity,¹ this may have been the first stroke in the campaign.

Racine replied in the bitter and adroit preface. After first defending, as before, the historicity of his characters, he proceeds to a direct assault² and picks unerringly the points of attack most favourable to himself. *vraisemblance* of character and plot (the only *vraisemblance*, be it noted, that Aristotle had demanded in plays: *vraisemblance* in representation was an Italian invention handed on to Chapelain by Madius, Scaliger and Castelvetro³); truth or *bienséance interne* in the treatment of history (un Lacédémonien grand parleur)—a neat stroke this, since it was the virtue on which Corneille prided himself, the principle he had taught Racine but failed to practise consistently, and it anticipates Corneille's criticism of *Bajazet*; and the simplicity of the true classical tradition.

... Pour contenter des juges si difficiles... il ne faudrait que s'écarter du naturel pour se jeter dans l'extraordinaire. Au lieu d'une action simple, chargée de peu de matière, telle que doit être une action qui se passe en un seul jour, et qui, s'avancant par degrés vers sa fin, n'est soutenue que par les intérêts, les sentiments et les passions des personnages, il faudrait remplir cette même action de quantité d'incidents qui ne se pourraient passer qu'en un mois, d'un grand nombre de jeux de théâtre, d'autant plus surprenants qu'ils seraient moins vraisemblables, d'une infinité de déclamations où l'on ferait dire aux acteurs tout le contraire de ce qu'ils devraient dire...

The same year saw the rival productions of the two *Bérénice*, in which it seems, by comparison of texts, that one writer, or more likely both, had information of the other's work. Racine seems deliberately to correct the un-Cornelian attitude of Corneille's Tite, who was prepared to give up the empire for love; and knowing also, we must believe, that Corneille was filling out his action with subsidiary figures (Domitie, Domitian) he pushed his own to the extreme of simplicity, thus illustrating the point made in the preface to *Britannicus*. He pressed it home in the preface to the new piece, the last combative preface he was to write:

... Ce n'est point une nécessité qu'il y ait du sang et des morts dans une tragédie; il suffit que l'action en soit grande, que les acteurs en soient héroïques, que les passions y soient excitées, et que tout s'y ressente de cette tristesse majestueuse qui fait tout le plaisir de la tragédie.

Je crus que je pourrais rencontrer toutes ces parties dans mon sujet. Mais ce qui m'en plut davantage, c'est que je le trouvai extrêmement simple. Il y avait longtemps que je voulais essayer si je pourrais faire une tragédie avec cette simplicité d'action qui a été si fort du goût des anciens. Car c'est un des premiers préceptes qu'ils nous ont laissés. 'Que ce que vous ferez, dit Horace, soit toujours simple et ne soit qu'un.' [And he quotes *Ajax*, *Philoctetes*, *Oedipus*, Terence, Menander.]

¹ Cf. Segrais' account of his visit to *Bajazet*, two years after, according to the oft-quoted passage of the *Segraisiana*.

² Professor Lancaster, who argues (*MLN*, LI (1936), pp. 8 ff.) that he associates Th. Corneille and Quinault with Pierre in this attack, allows that the majority of the allusions are to the latter.

³ Cf. Bray, *op. cit.*, III, ch. v.

The rule is based on reason: 'Il n'y a que le vraisemblable qui touche dans la tragédie, et quelle vraisemblance y a-t-il qu'il arrive en un jour une multitude de choses qui pourraient à peine arriver en plusieurs semaines?' It is not he who shows lack of inventiveness. 'Tout ce grand nombre d'incidents a toujours été le refuge des poètes qui ne sentaient dans leur génie ni assez d'abondance ni assez de force pour attacher durant cinq actes leurs spectateurs par une action simple, soutenue de la violence des passions, de la beauté des sentiments et de l'élégance de l'expression.'

This doctrine, it has often been pointed out, was that of D'Aubignac. For him, a play within the Unities was *étouffé* unless the author cut down his matter 'jusqu'à n'en avoir en apparence que pour faire un acte', filling the rest with the proper ornaments of tragedy, *passions, récits, discours*. He quotes Donatus (a novissimis argumenti rebus incipiens) and Scaliger (argumentum brevissimum sumendum, idque maxime varium multiplexque faciendum) and concludes:

Après donc qu'il aura choisi son sujet, il faut qu'il lui souvienne de prendre l'Action qu'il veut mettre sur le Théâtre à son dernier point, et s'il faut ainsi parler, à son dernier moment: et qu'il croie, pourvu qu'il n'ait point l'esprit stérile, que moins il aura de matière empruntée, plus il aura de liberté pour en inventer d'agréable...¹

This was the deduction drawn, in different forms, by all the generation which saw the introduction of the Unities. They suit pastoral, says Mairet,² where all is dialogue, but bar *les beaux effets*, i.e. the drama of action. Corneille's anonymous supporter, the author of the *Discours à Cliton*,³ says the same thing, and this was the main argument of the opponents of the Unities, from 1628 to 1637.

Corneille himself, having once decided to use the Unities, did his best by compromise to retain action—as Lanson suggests, because his psychology of will implied the assertion of will by acts—even to the detriment of *vraisemblance*; though he was pleased enough to acknowledge the doctrine of simplicity where he could show that he had observed it (*Cinna, Examen*). The Unities themselves were rules to be broken if necessary,⁴ and the *examen* of each of his tragedies includes a discussion of their application⁵

Racine was the more easily able to accept the system since he had never known any other. He practically never refers to the Unities, and then obliquely as in the two prefaces just quoted—certainly never

¹ *Pratique*, III, ch. v; cf. II, ch. III, IV, ch. II.

² *Silvanire*, préface.

³ Cf. Bray, *op. cit.*, pp. 272–3, 278.

⁴ *Œuvres* (1648), t. II, 'Au Lecteur'; *Troisième Discours*.

⁵ D'Aubignac had censured the complexity of Corneille's plots in his *Dissertations*. V. R. Bray, *La Tragédie cornélienne devant la critique classique*, Paris, 1927, ch. II.

o any constraint they impose. Hence he can readily accept the conclusion D'Aubignac draws from them. He alluded to it, as we have seen, as early as 1666.

D'Aubignac himself can scarcely have seen all the implications of his own doctrine. He has no quarrel with action, as many of his observations show, provided it can be squared with *vraisemblance*. The only example he finds¹ to quote of a play with this simplicity is Du Ryer's *Alcionée* (1637). This tragedy, which Professor Lancaster finds 'purement classique' and a foretaste of Racine,² is to me curiously reminiscent of sixteenth-century technique. A lover is rejected by his beloved's father in act II, and by the girl herself in act III. He commits suicide in act V, and is mourned by his mistress who secretly loved him. Her double attitude of love and resistance is determined before the action opens, and so is the father's, though the hero's discovery of them is shown. The situation once fully developed, there is not the slightest interaction of hero or heroine upon one another. The speeches are touching, but the play is empty of psychological as of physical action.

For all this, the theory of simplicity is present in the *Pratique*: action reduced to the minimum; space filled with the study of passion and with speeches which themselves are, or should be, in the true dramatic sense, action. But it was left for Racine to discover how to write a good tragedy according to these precepts.

Attic tragedy, which Racine quotes as his precedent, must have reinforced the authority of D'Aubignac, but cannot have helped him in the solution of his problem. It was far too remote from French practice and convention to serve as a model of structure.

Tite et Bérénice having failed and Racine remaining master of the field, we hear no more of simplicity. It had, as critics were not slow to point out, been carried too far. Certainly no later play of Racine's goes to anything like the extremes of *Bérénice*, though all remain simpler than Corneille's.

On the other hand, the prefaces of *Bajazet*, *Mithridate* and *Iphigénie* and all the new prefaces of the 1676 edition continue to harp on the historical or literary bases of the plots, and often on their extreme notoriety: 'Il n'y a guère de nom plus connu que celui de Mithridate.' 'Il n'y a rien de plus célèbre dans les poètes que le sacrifice d'Iphigénie.' 'C'est la Thébaïde. C'est-à-dire le sujet le plus tragique de l'antiquité.' 'Cette action d'Alexandre a passé pour une des plus belles que ce prince

¹ Professor Mornet finds others, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-37.

² Introduction of his crit. ed., Baltimore, 1930.

ait faites en sa vie.' Respect for history,¹ which we may call the first principle, in time and in importance, of Racine's *poétique*, is, as I have shown, a heritage from Corneille. *Phèdre*, compared with preceding plays on the subject, was to be its most striking application. Corneille was wrong to pick a quarrel with his rival on this point.

Racine's second tenet, simplicity of plot, he preached in opposition to Corneille and deliberately exaggerated in *Bérénice* to show up Corneille's inattention to the rule; to this extent Racine owes it to him also.

III. QUINAULT: OPERA AND GREEK TRAGEDY

After *Mithridate* came the nineteen months' break on which all the critics have commented, after six years in which Racine had brought out a new play every winter. We are not here concerned to explain the interval—perhaps it was due to lassitude, as Masson-Forestier² suggested, perhaps the abandoned project of *Iphigénie en Tauride* wasted some of the time—but we must seek a reason why his next play was of a new type, the adaptation of a play by Euripides. Corneille had only adapted ancient plays twice—drawing both times almost exclusively on Seneca—and nothing in *Iphigénie* or its successor *Phèdre* seems designed in the old spirit of emulation with the now vanquished rival.

Most of the reasons suggested for this change seem unsatisfactory. M. Mornet considers *Iphigénie* another 'tragédie grande' à la Corneille, and ignores both the interval and the change of source. Masson-Forestier's thesis,³ that Racine was so tired by fast living as to be incapable of inventing any more plots for himself, need not be discussed. A more common explanation is that, the self-imposed struggle with Corneille over, Racine was free to follow his own bent—'évidemment il va revenir à ses chers Grecs'.⁴

But up till now it had not seemed a natural bent; and to return to his beloved Greeks he would need to have frequented them before. Now *La Thébaine*, despite the preface—written after *Iphigénie*—follows Rotrou (and Statius and Seneca in second and third place) far more than Euripides; *Andromaque*, by Racine's own admission, is based on Virgil with only a few hints from the Athenian. *Les Plaideurs* contains

¹ Sr. M. Haley (*op. cit.*, pp. 141, 195-6) makes the point that Racine respects only 'what his public knows of history', and aims merely at convincing it that what he shows is true, using the prefaces to that end. This is so, but the public he considers is much more judicious and cultivated than that pleased by, e.g., Quinault

² *Autour d'un Racine ignoré*, Paris, 1910, p. 327.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 300-1.

⁴ J. Lemaitre, *Jean Racine*, ch. VIII, p. 239.

just three scenes from Aristophanes. The five subsequent tragedies deal with historical epochs and are derived, like most of Corneille's and of their contemporaries', from historical narratives.

Racine had made some use of Euripides in writing *La Thébaine* and *Andromaque*. His annotated volumes testify that, at some period, he had studied both Sophocles and Euripides, if not exhaustively, closely and repeatedly. The first reference to Greek playwrights¹ appears in the preface to *Britannicus* (1669), in that of *Bérénice* they are more numerous, and abundant thereafter. (Corneille had used such references in the same way.) The nineteen months may have seen some serious study of the Attic tragedians, but we still have to look for the occasion which turned Racine towards their imitation.

A recent and most plausible theory is that of M. E. Gros,² who points to the rise of a new dramatic genre which by its aesthetic shortcomings, its pretensions, and the personalities concerned in it, could not but call forth Racine's indignant opposition, and lead him, as already twice before, to put his competitors right by doing what they were doing as it should be done.

French opera had been put on a permanent basis in 1671 by a privilege granted to Perrin. Corneille, Molière and Quinault had composed *Psyché*, Gilbert a *Plaisirs et Peines d'Amour*. In 1672 Lulli succeeded to Perrin, engaging as his librettist Philippe Quinault, a man well qualified for Racine's enmity.

Quinault was a younger and a more successful Gilbert, a poet, like him, of the salons. He had started his career with imbroglia-comedies and with *tragi-comédies* of the pattern we have described. (*Le Feint Alcibiade* ascribes to the Athenian statesman a twin sister who, under his name, gets into scrapes—all for love—in Sparta.) Then, when the tragedy was languishing in 1658-9, he, with Thomas Corneille, gave it a semblance of new life by importing into it as much as it would take of the spirit of *tragi-comédie*, or of the 'heroic' novel, its inspiration. *La Mort de Cyrus* (1658-9) is famous for a Cyrus who leaves his army to defeat for love of the Scythian queen Thomyris, equally in love with him as it proves. The love-lorn queen comes from *Le Grand Cyrus*; the reciprocated, but still unhappy, affection is Quinault's original contribution. *Astrate* (1664) is known by the attacks of Boileau, who honoured

¹ Except to mention Euripides as a source of *Andromaque*.

² *Philippe Quinault*, Paris, 1926. Gros adopts with highly justifiable attenuations a theory of Brunetière and Doumic. I am deeply indebted to Gros for all that follows on the subject of Racine and the opera, though I go further than he, since he believes in Racine's 'natural bias' towards Greek subjects.

Quinault with persistent hostility. *Bellérophon* (1670-1) treats its subject much in the manner of Gilbert's *Hypolite*.

Apart from music, the main features of French opera, thanks to its origins in Italian opera and the French machine-play of the 'forties and 'fifties, was a lavish use of stage spectacle—aerial flights and *changements à vue*—of precisely that visual element, dear to a large section of the public of 1630-40, which the establishment of the Unities rendered impossible and the psychological tragedy made a point of disregarding. (The opera, characteristically, broke the unity of place.) Aerial flights were appropriate only for divine or supernaturally gifted personages, and transformation scenes were most easily rendered *vraisemblables* in the same way. So naturally, like the machine-plays before it, opera turned for its subjects to Greco-Roman legend. In 1672-3 Quinault wrote for Lulli two libretti based on Ovid (*Les Fêtes de l'Amour et de Bacchus*, *Cadmus*). If Racine had wind of his plans in time,¹ his composition of *Iphigénie* may have been influenced by the fact that Quinault's third opera, produced the same year as *Iphigénie*, was to be *Alceste*, a remarkably free adaptation of Euripides.

Naturally, considering Quinault's past record, the psychological ingredient in his compositions consisted of those 'lieux communs de morale lubrique' which later shocked Boileau's moral sense, and must have shocked Racine's aesthetic taste by their shallowness, conventionality and monotony. Add to this that the exigences of the music greatly shortened the dialogue, which was in *vers libre*, and made impossible any subtlety of characterization or of expression; and further that Lulli's music was blamed, it seems, even in its own day, for lack of psychological profundity.

Lulli insisted on calling this hotch-potch of gallantry and tinsel mythology *tragédie lyrique*, with the implication, as Gros suggests,² that it was far more truly than 'legitimate' tragedy the inheritor of the Attic stage, re-incorporating as it did song, spectacle and the dance. Racine, who knew, none better, what Greek tragedy had been, and was not far removed from claiming proprietary rights in his knowledge, must have been furious.³

These facts are I think sufficient to explain *Iphigénie*. It was Racine's first attempted counterblast to the opera.

¹ *Alceste* was in rehearsal November 1673 (*op. cit.*, pp. 107-8); *Iphigénie* was produced August 1674.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 522, 723-4.

³ 'Aurons-nous beaucoup de peine à nous figurer l'indignation que suscitait en lui le succès scandaleux de Quinault? et la tentation qui lui venait, assez naturellement, de remettre Quinault à sa place, le public dans la vérité, et l'antiquité dans son jour?' (Brunetière, *Époques du Théâtre*, [1892], 5^e éd., p. 171).

Quinault was taking classical subjects, and taking them from legend; he was using mythology and *le merveilleux*, he had chosen Euripides as source. *Iphigénie* was to show him how it should be done. 'Une action simple... qui . n'est soutenue que par les intérêts, les sentiments et les passions des personnages'; a *nœud* depending, once the supernatural *donnée* is accepted, entirely on these human motives, a *dénouement* which shall be the probable or necessary outcome of the *nœud*; *nec deus intersit*—only the human sacrifice and the miracle of the winds, essential to the subject, are retained, and these in *récits*;

Le soldat étonné dit que dans une nue
Jusque sur le bûcher Diane est descendue,

but the heroine is saved by other means springing out of the action itself, in respect for the audience's credulity, which the opera did not consider overmuch. An apparently operatic subject has been treated without departure from Racine's (and D'Aubignac's and Aristotle's) idea of tragic construction.

The preface of the play suggests that Racine was following Quinault's work. Another of Boileau's enemies, one of the Perraults, had published an essay comparing *Alceste* favourably with Euripides' tragedy. Racine's well-known reply has not a word in reference to Lulli, to Quinault or to their *Alceste*; they enjoyed royal favour, and Gros suggests that Racine did not wish to jeopardize his own standing at court. Instead, he vents all his spleen on the pamphleteer, without naming him, for his blasphemies against Euripides, trounces him thoroughly for two or three misinterpretations of the text, and reads him a lecture on the respect due to antiquity.

The collaboration went on producing a new opera yearly (*Thésée*, from Plutarch (1675), *Atys*, from Ovid again (1676)). In 1677 appeared *Phèdre*, which long ago was called the most operatic of Racine's tragedies.¹ Whereas *Iphigénie* had accepted a legendary subject only to suppress its specifically legendary aspects and treat it like a subject drawn from history, *Phèdre* stands alone for its frank acceptance and masterly use of supernatural material.

I cannot accept the explanation² that the *merveilleux* of the *dénouement* forced Racine to justify it by spreading this element over the whole play, for in the parallel case of *Iphigénie* he had not done so.

He may, of course, when he came to write *Phèdre*, have decided that he had made a mistake with the earlier play. Gilbert and the obscure provincial Bidar, his precursors in the theme of Phaedra and Hippolytus,

¹ Id., *ibid.*

² Put forward by Miss Newton, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

had provided an awful example by modernizing their subject so much as to leave nothing supernatural but the dragon raised up by Theseus' prayers.

Another fault committed by these writers may have contributed to Racine's decision. They had kept the ancient names and completely falsified the action: their Phèdre was unmarried (as Racine's Hermione had been—let us not throw stones!) and therefore guiltless in relation to Thésée. Gilbert's heroine is guiltless also of Hypolite's death.¹ Racine resolutely restored the marriage and therewith the guilt (in intention at least) of adultery and incest. When at the same time he accentuated the antiquity of the action, his aim was perhaps, as some have thought, to 'dépayser le plus possible les spectateurs'² and help them thus to accept things more shocking even than the 'brutalities' of Pyrrhus.

Personally I prefer to believe, or at least to add to the foregoing, that *Phèdre* was a second counterblast to the opera, the result of maturer thought than *Iphigénie*. If you are to use ancient myth, he must have realized, you must falsify your pictures (historical fidelity being still the great consideration) unless you use ancient local colour too, giving your characters the thoughts and the language you think they would or should have had—though always attempting to reconcile these, in accordance with *la bienséance externe*, with the manners of the audience.

In a story where the gods take part in human affairs you must introduce the gods. The opera was doing so, though only in order to gratify the audience with the sight of flying chariots and apotheoses, *Alceste* had introduced five or six divinities in addition to the two shown by Euripides. But this is the wrong way, at least for tragedy as Racine practised it, where the action, strictly ruled by logic and probability, takes place in human minds, and its *péripéties* are shown in speech. The world of gods, heroes and monsters invades, not the stage, but the dialogue of *Phèdre*, and Racine's poetic texture is marvellously enriched by a wealth of allusion—to the divine ancestry of the actors, to the exploits of Theseus, to the hatred of Venus and the too faithful friendship of Neptune.

Of the three plays Racine is supposed to have left unfinished in 1677, *Iphigénie en Tauride* and *Alceste* were probably conceived earlier, and *Œdipe* cannot be placed with any certainty. The evidence for the last two is flimsy, and all three seem to me rather foreign to Racine's tech-

¹ Pradon was blamed by contemporaries for following the same procedure—a proof, according to Miss Newton, *op. cit.*, p. 83, that Racine's ideas had made headway.

² Cf. G. Michaut, *Sur la 'Phèdre' de Racine*, 1900, p. 5.

nique. *Iphigénie* and *Œdipe* depend on concealed identity, which Racine used little (*Iph. en Aulide*, *Athalie*). *Alceste* and *Œdipe* have dénouements which are not the outcome of interactions of character (though so also has *Athalie*). If we accept the tradition, we must conclude that Racine's recent enthusiasm for the Greeks was transforming his *poétique*. We shall note also that all three are subjects of Greek plays—one by Sophocles, whom Racine never elsewhere tackled; and further that Corneille had written an *Œdipe* and Quinault an *Alceste*.

From 1674 onwards Racine could rightly be called, as Boileau and Fénelon called him, the pupil of Sophocles and Euripides (or at least of the latter). He had had the time, and opera had given him the incentive, to study the models by which French tragedians claimed to be inspired. There were, however, in Quinault's libretti two elements which could claim some connexion with ancient tragedy, and which Racine could not hope to reintroduce on the commercial non-lyrical stage. These were the chorus and the use of singing. They continued to occupy his mind.

His interest in the drama did not cease with his retirement, whatever his son said seventy years after. He prepared new editions of his works (1687, 1697). La Grange-Chancel claims¹ that he helped him with his *coups d'essai*, and the same is recounted of Campistron.² He circulated epigrams against plays and playwrights he disliked. His wrath against the opera must have been fomented by Boileau's (*Satire contre les Femmes*, 1693). The two friends were accused of intriguing, during a temporary eclipse of Quinault (1679), to prevent Thomas Corneille from yielding the place he had usurped.³

When, eleven years after his retirement, Mme de Maintenon asked him to write, 'sur quelque sujet de piété et de morale, une espèce de poème où le chant fût mêlé avec le récit, le tout lié par une action',⁴ it was almost certainly a sacred opera that was in her mind. Dangeau⁵ describes the work in progress as 'un opéra dont le sujet est Esther et Assuérus'. It was played during Carnival in 1689 and 1690, as the profane operas had been at court in earlier years. The prologue of *Esther*, except for its metre, is in the operatic not the Greek tradition.

But Racine, asked for an opera, set out to write a Greek tragedy. The third of the principles of his *poétique*, which Quinault had given him, had gained strength in the interval; and, what may be more important, he

¹ *Œuvres* (1746), préface, and *ibid.*, *Oreste*, préface.

² La Porte, *Anecdotes dramatiques*, III, p. 87.

³ Gros, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

⁴ *Esther*, préface.

⁵ *Journal*, 18 août, 1688, quoted by Doumic, *Études sur la litt. fr.*, p. 123.

was writing for a private stage which was not confined by Lulli's privilege, as were the Hôtel and the Marais (since 1674), to six fiddles and two voices. The scene of *Esther* changes with each act; this was a concession. Full use is made of singing—but not the use Lulli made of it; as in Greek tragedy the dialogue is still spoken. Hence an important new step towards the Greek model—a singing chorus separating the acts (though it does not remain permanently on the stage, and the *form* of its songs, since there could be no question of adapting Greek lyric metres, is operatic).

Je m'aperçus qu'en travaillant sur le plan qu'on m'avait donné, j'exécuteis en quelque sorte un dessein qui m'avait souvent passé dans l'esprit, qui était de lier, comme dans les anciennes tragédies grecques, le chœur et le chant avec l'action, et d'employer à chanter les louanges du vrai Dieu cette partie du chœur que les païens employaient à chanter les louanges de leurs fausses divinités.¹

This use of the national religion, it has often been pointed out, is another step in the same direction.

Esther was a miniature, and transgressed some of the restrictions of tragedy. *Athalie*, in five acts, with a subject of terror and pity, is a real and great tragedy. It returns to the unity of place. It eschews spectacle for its own sake, the scene being the *péristyle grec un peu nu* regretted by Sainte-Beuve; or rather it allows—imitating the opera, but in accordance with Greek usage—one *changement à vue*: 'Ici le fond du théâtre s'ouvre. On voit le dedans du temple; et les lévites armés sortent de tous côtés sur la scène' (v, 5). But, as M. Gros well shows, this is at the very end, when all the psychological action has taken place; not even the coronation was exhibited, lest its visual appeal should distract from its significance.

Athalie makes two more innovations in the restoration of Greek usage: the chorus has a *coryphée*; and Racine has 'essayé d'imiter des anciens cette continuité d'action qui fait que leur théâtre ne demeure jamais vide, les intervalles des actes n'étant marqués que par des hymnes et par des moralités du chœur'.

It is not certain whether Racine had consciously in mind another project which was ascribed to him²—the suppression of the ubiquitous love-interest in tragedy. In the sacred dramas, necessarily, he omitted the theme. *Iphigénie* had attenuated it, but no further perhaps than *Britannicus* or *Mithridate*, and it may be solely for variety. *Phèdre* turns on love, though in an essentially tragic form, and the conventional idyll

¹ *Esther*, préface. D'Aubignac, who discusses the Greek chorus at great length, speaks of the desirability of some re-introduction of music and choruses into French drama, *Pratique*, III, chs. IV, VI.

² L. Racine, *Mémoires*, in Racine, *Œuvres*, I, p. 269, Fénelon, *Lettre à l'Académie*, VI, D'Olvet, *Histoire de l'Académie*, II, p. 343.

still accompanies the agonies of Venus's victim. How, at least before his retirement, could he have contemplated a type of play which no public would have stood and no commercial theatre accepted? He may, in his later years, have talked austere of the desirability of a change in popular taste.

If this sketch is substantially correct, Racine's evolution consists in the gradual adoption and exploration of three principles:

(i) respect for ancient manners and ancient history—through hostility to Gilbert and the romanesque tradition, and under the influence of Corneille and Racine's own knowledge of the ancient classics;

(ii) simplicity of structure—through hostility to Corneille and under the influence of d'Aubignac;

(iii) a progressive return to the Greek model—through hostility to the opera and under the influence of his increasing appreciation of Sophocles (presumably) and Euripides.

These three principles may seem to omit one of the most notable achievements of Racine—the full realization of the 'classical' ideal of a completely internal, because psychological, action, in which the mechanism of the passions supplies all the *péripéties*. But this must have appeared to Racine as simply the consequence of two rules: first, that the incidents of a play must be linked by the strictest 'necessity or probability' (Aristotle, D'Aubignac), second, that the action must be simple. It is in the passage already cited from the preface to *Britannicus* that he comes nearest to formulating it, where he contrasts 'une action simple . . . qui . . . n'est soutenue que par . . . les sentiments et les passions des personnages' with one full of 'quantité d'incidents . . . d'un grand nombre de jeux de théâtre . . .'. It was in the air in his day, inasmuch as all the *mondains* after, say, 1640 were more interested in sentiments than in actions;¹ but I am not aware that any playwright or critic clearly conceived it as a principle in the seventeenth or even the eighteenth century—for it is precisely here that Racine's imitators failed to follow him. I doubt if he was conscious of it himself, for all its importance in his art.

Of his conscious artistic convictions, not one is entirely of his own invention; but their sources are perhaps less interesting, in my view, than the spirit of contradiction which led him to seek to show up, in his prefaces and plays alike, the faults he saw in his rivals and adversaries.

This is not to deny him originality, or to attempt to explain all his talent. It simply shows him as a man extremely sensitive to contem-

¹ D'Aubignac, quoted above; Scudéry, *L'Illustre Bassa*, préface.

porary tendencies, some of whose merit, considered as a contributor to dramatic theory, lies in his rejection or correction of what he disliked therein. It shows also that his *poétique*, never fixed, grew with and out of his practice. He accepted with serene confidence the external form worked out for his genre by his predecessors—but even so all artists, even the most revolutionary, must accept more than they condemn of the medium they inherit. In those questions which appeared to him as such, he was experimental and combative.

He never succeeded in imposing his views on the majority. The ‘classical school’ was never more than a handful—some of them united by friendship, some supported sometimes by court influence—struggling against the prevailing taste. In the Tragedy there were only two such figures, who dissipated their influence, if not their talents, by unnecessary enmity. The real taste of their public, which they held at bay each for some ten years, was characterized by a writer of 1632:

La plus grande part de ceux qui portent le teston à l’Hôtel de Bourgogne, veulent que l’on contente leurs yeux par la diversité et changement de la face du théâtre, et que le grand nombre des accidents et aventures extraordinaires leur ôtent la connaissance du sujet.¹

And this is the taste which in spite of all that they could do outlived them. For the tragedy of the eighteenth century, though it took its diction slavishly from Racine, re-introduced from the *tragi-comédie*, from the opera, and from what could be understood of Shakespeare, precisely those elements of action and spectacle of which classical theory and example should have cured it.

R. C. KNIGHT.

BIRMINGHAM.

¹ Rayssiguier, *Aminte*, ‘Avis au Lecteur’.

ARCHERY AND CHIVALRY: A NOBLE PREJUDICE

Ithern von Gaheviez
er jæmerlichen ligen liez.
der was doch tot so minneclich:
lebende was er sælden rich.
wære ritterschaft sin endes wer
zer tjost durch schilt mit eime sper,
wer klagete dan die wunders not?



ER STARP VON EIME GABYLOT

Iwanet uf in do brach
der liehten blumen z'eime dach.
er stiez den gabylotes stil
zuo z'im nach der marter zil,
der knappe kiusche unde stolz
druete en kriuzes wis ein holz
durch des gabylotes sniden. (*Parzival*, 159, 5 ff.)

THE pathos of the brief epitaph which Wolfram raises to Ither in the middle of the passage quoted above is inescapable. Ither's was a tragic death. Beloved of the ladies, he was cut off in his prime. Admired by the valiant, he was slain by a raw youth at an irresponsible behest and for a trifle. He was despoiled of his armour like a ruffian of yore before his body was cold. But such fatal spite is forgotten by Wolfram when it comes to the making of an epitaph and the appointment of a Christian grave. The salient thing about Ither, in spite of a life full of incident about which we can only speculate, was that he was slain by a javelin.

In an earlier passage Wolfram has told us why. Parzival had wanted to add his javelin to the knightly arms he had so lately come by, but the courteous page Iwanet had answered (157, 19 f.):

ich enreiche dir kein gabylot:
diu ritterschaft dir daz verbot.

The javelin was not a permissible weapon for a knight. We are reminded of Hartmann's sympathy with Cadoc in *Erec* which is as much for the moral hurt he sustained from the whips of the uncouth pair of giants, as for his shredded skin (5411 f.):

si brachen vaste ritters reht
und *handelten* den guoten kneht.

Erec is almost ashamed to have witnessed Cadoc's degradation and tactfully adds at a later opportunity 'wie dicke ich wirs gehandelt bin!'

(5673). But on examination the vulgar associations of the javelin prove to be of another order than those of the whip. They are inseparable from the stigma which attached to missile weapons as a class, whether javelins, arrows or stones. Of these weapons, arrows were by far the most efficient, and so it is a study of the social position of archery which will throw most light on Wolfram's intriguing expression of sentiment on Ither's death. Indeed, the study of a prejudice against archery which was apt to prove suicidal on occasion might well reveal something of the general mentality of the men who contrived to entertain it.

The reserve with which the formidable weapon of archery was treated by the knights of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a military aristocracy par excellence, is extraordinary on the face of it, and however tempting it is at this distance to ascribe it to yet another quirk of feudal mentality, it would not be right to do so. This neglect of bow and arrow was often attended with disastrous results when measured by the standards the knights would have preferred for themselves, by military ones.

Attention was accordingly given to details of armour or tactics which may seem excessive. But although most of the material assembled here concerning the status of archery is known to historians, the writer is responsible for what has been made of it in the present study, guided as he was by courtly expressions of opinion in literary sources. Historical and literary texts together seemed to reveal an unsuspected, yet tragic, dilemma in the knightly caste with regard to archery: as military specialists they could either perfect a weapon which, if turned against them, inevitably threatened their cavalry and hence their supremacy as a caste, or they could repress its development to the utmost of their powers and in their neglect of it lay themselves open to those who succeeded in defying their repressive measures. For reasons which are not perfectly clear they chose the latter way, though undoubtedly prompted by their enthusiasm for quick and showy results, their lack of self-control, and their passion for the charge.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, thanks to the comfortable ratio of defensive to offensive armour, it was possible for warfare to assume a romantic glamour for the knightly caste such as had not been the case in the Heroic Age itself, hence the revival of the earlier heroic literature and the introduction into it of feudal and romantic elements. The story of the growth of the thirteenth-century *Nibelungenlied* will show what is meant. By Chaucer's time, and above all in Chaucer's country, the glamour was largely gone, and Froissart's chivalry bears an elegiac stamp: the offensive was gaining the upper hand, the result of

all kinds of ungentlemanly, free-thinking innovations by centralizing monarchs and urban patricians, not least among them the perfection of archery. In the *Knight's Tale* Theseus decides that the contention between Palamon and Arcite does not justify the carnage of the real battle at first envisaged (T. 2537 ff.):

The lord hath of his heigh discrecioun
 Considered, that it were destruccioun
 To gentil blood, to fighten in the gyse
 Of mortal bataille now in this empryse;
 Wherefore, to shapen that they shul not dye,
 He wol his firste purpos modifye.
 No man, therfor, up peyne of los of lyf,
 No maner shot, ne pollax, ne short knyf
 Into the listes sende, or thider bringe;
 Ne short swerd for to stoke, with poynt bytinge,
 No man ne drawe, ne bere it by his syde.
 Ne no man shal un-to his felawe ryde
 But o cours, with a sharp y-grounde spere;
 Foyne, if him liste, on fote, him-self to were.
 And he that is at meschief, shal be take,
 And noght slayn, but be brought un-to the stake....

In forbidding the things he does Theseus is largely undoing history, for in the early fourteenth century the French nobility were shocked by the employment in warfare of footmen with short knives to dispatch the unhorsed;¹ in the thirteenth century the battle-sword had ceded its blunt end for a point, 'for stoking'; and in the twelfth century the use of bow and arrows in Christian warfare had been banned with some success by Pope and Emperor. In thus rendering a fourteenth-century combat harmless, Theseus was harking back to the conditions of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century feudal battle, which was scarcely more lethal than a contemporary tournament, or the 'Tourneyng' of the *Knight's Tale* (T. 2557), an archaic and romantic form of combat to which Chaucer does full poetic justice by alliteration (T. 2607 ff.):

Up springen speres twenty foot on highte,
 Out goon the swerdes as the silver brighte.
 The helmes they to-hewen and to-shrede;
 Out brest the blood, with sterne stremes rede.
 With mighty maces the bones they to-breste.
 He thurgh the thikkeste of the throng gan threste.
 Ther stomblen stedes stronge, and down goth al.

The milder fate prescribed by Theseus for those who fell reminds us that in Chaucer's century the fallen nobles were quite likely to have been slain in serious warfare, since their ransoms no longer appealed so eloquently to the mercy of the conqueror as in the twelfth, owing to the increasing impoverishment of the lesser gentry and their decline in

¹ With which Charles of Anjou had shocked the Italians a hundred years before!

military value. One of the services in which they had failed to compete with their professional rivals, it will appear, was archery, their bane until the advent of the pike and hand-gun.

The knights of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, then, could afford to regard warfare with comparative equanimity. The closer their bond of international brotherhood grew, the less intensely did they seek each other's destruction. To kill a knight was to impose a considerable wergeld on oneself, one forfeited his ransom, while to kill his horse was to forego a rich prize. It paid to be sporting, both to spare life and to go for the man and not the horse. In these days mail and shield offered very fair protection against lance and arrows and comparatively few knights lost their lives in a feudal battle. It was the infantry who furnished the realistic rivers of blood without which even the glowing imagination of a knight would not have considered an encounter to be a battle. He himself was as likely to be 'discomfited', as it was aptly called, by stunning through fashionable but impracticable cylindrical helmets or being unhorsed in some other way, as by mortal wounds. In short, the knighthood's chosen arms of lance and sword, mail and shield, were admirably adapted to their self-esteem. Hence the exaggerated eulogy of these arms in fiction, and sometimes pathetic adherence to them in fact.

In binding himself to the lance and sword the twelfth-century knight was laying himself open to any comparable force which chose to fight differently. He managed to stave off the day when ignoble foot soldiery dared meet him unaided in a major conflict, but in his heyday suffered reverses at the hands of Saracens, burghers and royal mercenaries and levies, elements which made use of archery in varying degrees. These defeats were naturally not only due to a weakness in archery, but also to foibles of a strictly cognate nature, to rashness, a mania for the charge of heavy cavalry and a scorn of his own foot-soldiery which sometimes led him to sacrifice them. The Saracens taught him a serious respect for archery, but his only reply was to delegate the unpleasant task to Turcoples and sergeants, the very etymology of whose names tells the story, for Turcoples were originally mercenary Turkish horse-archers, and *sergeant* is derived from *servientes*. These archers were as specialized in their art as the knight in his, and both were lost if separated from each other in combat with the more versatile and less prejudiced Saracen. Others who practised archery were not to be taken seriously and were lumped together with the throwers of javelins and brickbats.

The situation of the knight in the Europe of the twelfth century can

be rendered in a few words. He owed his supremacy to the irresistible impetus of his heavy cavalry and long lance, his coat of mail, his shield and biting sword. If one adds as a corollary his growing consciousness of himself as a man of caste, one also understands how less successful weapons like the javelin and the bow in the state in which it was allowed to remain came to bear the stigma of social as well as military inferiority. But warfare in the East and in succeeding centuries in Europe itself proves that archery in the right hands was capable of mastering him unless he employed it too. He was well aware of its efficiency, as passages from his own literature will show—Europe was surrounded by splendid horse-archers—but never as a man of caste did he use it himself, whatever he may have done as a hireling. Militarily speaking he was a reactionary. he based his whole supremacy on weapons which were nevertheless liable to be mastered, and were mastered in the end.

There are clear signs of his reactionary attitude in the legislation of the Church and State, that is in the sphere of moral domination. In 1139 archery was banned in Lateran Council. 'Artem illam mortiferam et Deo odibilem ballistariorum et sagittariorum adversos Christianos et Catholicos exerceri de caetero sub anathemate prohibemus.' In the next decade Conrad III gave this his sanction for the Empire, and Canon No. 18 of a later Lateran Council of 1215 mentions cross-bowmen together with leaders of mercenary bands, and surgeons as the most horrible types of men of blood. Of course the wounds dealt by bolt and arrow were terrible, as Wolfram von Eschenbach and Wirnt von Gravenberg are not ashamed to own, but the loophole left for use against the Infidel and above all the interest of Conrad III (who was largely responsible for the consolidation of the knighthood in Germany as a caste), together with the papal and imperial collaboration against mercenaries, the only formidable bowmen, are enough to indicate that the prohibition of archery was not a matter of altruism alone. The damage done to imperial troops by the hired bowmen of Cologne as early as 1106 was considerable enough to suggest to the knighthood what might happen if archery came to be so highly developed as in the Near East.¹ The ban on archery against Christians must have had the primary motive of maintaining the position of the feudal class not so much against the peasant as the burgher and centralizing monarch—the employers of mercenaries. This is attested by

¹ Cf. P. Schmitthenner, *Das freie Soldnertum im abendländischen Imperium des Mittelalters* (1934), p. 74. Schmitthenner's work is most enlightening and does adequate justice to the rivalry of the conservative knight with the versatile hireling in an age of declining barter and increasing monetary values. The present writer is indebted to it for information on the dynamic situation and corroboration of some of his inferences concerning the knight and archery.

the German *Waffenrecht* and the trend of history itself: the object of the reactionary *Waffenrecht* was to forbid *arma*, the knightly weapons of lance, sword and mail together with the war-horse, to the peasant, leaving him the despised knife and missile weapons including the bow; whereas it was the bow as the mercenaries and territorial levies used it which menaced and then finally vanquished the knight.¹ This will explain the contempt of the knights for missile weapons in the hands of peasants and the rabble, and their indignation where the other non-feudal elements have to be reckoned with.

The diehard attitude of the medieval gentleman towards the bow is almost without parallel. It has been remarked that the greater Homeric heroes disdain it, that a gentleman like Ulysses leaves it at home when he goes to the wars,² but this does not amount to the absolute taboo of the knight. It is clearly 'impossible' to shoot a man down who is known to give a good account of himself in hand-to-hand fighting, and this sentiment is met with in literatures as widely separated as the Greek, the Japanese and the medieval French. But the knight only drew bow against animals. The Saracens were quick to learn the advantages of the heavy mounted lancer from the Frank, but did not discard the bow for that reason, the Kabbaleros of the medieval Byzantine Empire did not deny themselves the bow because they were the best heavy cavalry before the coming of the Norman, the fastidious Japanese noblemen worshipped the sword, but cultivated the bow and its history as well. But all that the knight could do when he met the Byzantine and the Saracen was to delegate the art of archery to hirelings and social inferiors; all that he could do when competing with these latter in turn for the hire of territorial princes³ was to make his magnificent charge both in and out of season to the glory and destruction of chivalry. By the test of the Crusades and ultimately of warfare in Europe the knight allowed his caste pride and his passion for one kind of fighting to affect his general efficiency as a warrior to a degree not usually met with at his level of culture. If in the East he allowed himself to be separated from his archers, as he all too frequently did, he might be forced to surrender unscathed, from the damage done to his horses by the arrow-fire of the

¹ See H. Fehr, 'Das Waffenrecht der Bauern im Mittelalter', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, xxxv, Germanist. Abt. (1914) 139. The same general ban on the peasants' bearing arms held in France, too: see E. Boutaric, *Institutions militaires de la France* (1863), p. 151. The peasantry as a class did not count as an object of serious military education.

² W. Tarn, *Hellenist Military and Naval Developments* (1930).

³ The *solidum* of a well-equipped mercenary and that of a knight were about the same at the end of the thirteenth century. In Spain, by a curious irony, an archer with an up-to-date steel cross-bow was considered rich enough to support a knighthood.

enemy. In Europe he might have to fight against those who disposed of far larger numbers of mercenary archers than he. And yet he remained conservative in his choice of weapons. Such fastidiousness may seem surprising in so ruffianly a person as the common knight, but it has to be remembered that he was a man of caste nevertheless, and if he was not going to show this as a warrior, there were very few other ways left open to him. Such was the prejudice. How is it to be accounted for?

The treatises on military tactics by Delbruck,¹ Oman² and Delpech³ testify to the fact, but do not provide a complete solution. In the early days the knight was still inclined to dismount in a tight corner and fight on foot and so would not have been sufficiently at home in the saddle to attain the minimum standard of efficiency in archery, unlike the Turkish or Mongolian tribesmen who were accustomed to live on horseback. The forests and swamps of Europe at that time did not encourage the spontaneous development of mounted archery, which needs wide plains for manœuvring, nor for reasons which are quite obscure did the continental Germanic infantry cultivate it—it was the Norsemen and the Goths who made the most striking use of the arm and the Migration Period in which they played so prominent a part saw a more intensive use of the bow.⁴ The evidence of the *Hildebrandslied* and *Beowulf* is that 'sharp showers' of missile weapons were to be met with all in a day's work. A hero like old Hildebrand might even make his own contribution to them. *Sceotand* was a common Germanic by-word for 'warrior'. But the use of missile weapons was not highly developed. The Saxons, who had beaten an army of Norsemen, were beaten in turn by the organized employment of missiles in combination with cavalry by the Normans. It must be remembered that a successful use of any missile weapon demands not only rational direction but vast stores of ammunition, as was proved so recently as the World War.⁵ It needed a sophisticated Persian like Surenas at Carrhae to make the horse-archer 'the potential master of the world', and his great generalship before and during the battle showed qualities of mind quite foreign to the tribesmen of the Germanic migrations. Archery there was in Europe, and if it remained undeveloped this was not due to definite discouragement by the war-leaders: Egil the archer in the obscure story of Wayland is not a dishonourable figure. Even the Spartans could not afford to dispense with

¹ *Geschichte der Kriegskunst* (1900–36), III, 304 ff.

² *History of the Art of War* (1923).

³ *La Tactique au xiv^e Siècle* (1885).

⁴ Jähns, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der alten Trutzwaffen* (1899), p. 312.

⁵ Tarn, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

archery altogether, uninspiring as it must have been for serious warriors to use. It would therefore be rash without positive evidence to derive the knight's prejudice from the Heroic Age. And yet it had hardened by the twelfth century. Why foot-archery, the most effective of all against horsemen because of its longer range, was not developed in early times must remain a mystery. But once granted the military supremacy of the knight, the rest seems to follow.

Until the end of the thirteenth century, when the *couverture* or metal barding for horses became more general, the knight's mount was exposed to missile weapons, however well the knight himself was protected by his coat of mail.¹ Missile weapons were cheap to manufacture, but horses were one of the most expensive items of knightly equipment. The inference is obvious. Even if archery was not to be actively suppressed at the beginning of the knight's ascendancy, as it was in the twelfth century, it was bound to be neglected: firstly because he, the military specialist of his age, was not minded to perfect a weapon which was a potential menace to his own superiority; and secondly because this very superiority was founded on a renunciation of the other important missile weapon, the javelin, for the heavy cavalry in which he put his faith logically needed the heavy lance which ceased to be thrown as its name implies it should be.² A social distinction had thus crept in between those who threw and those who did not, a distinction which can be adequately explained as the result of the knight's specialization as a heavy lancer and the technical development of his weapon, in combination with his consciousness of his social status.³ After some time, what must at first have been lofty contempt, and occasional annoyance when a horse was galled, became a caste prejudice and finally the fixed idea of a diehard. But what has not yet been explained is how archery lost the race to cavalry in the first place, if it was not due to a general disability to organize, and a greater mystery would be why the knighthood failed to break themselves of their prejudice once it was clear that it was demoded, if suicidal attachment to tradition were not known in the world to-day.

¹ But mail did not protect the knight from cross-bow bolts. His mount was protected from neither in the twelfth century as a rule, and this is another reason for detecting a political significance in the papal canon of 1139: if it had been a matter of preventing ghastly wounds, a prohibition of the cross-bow would have sufficed, not of all archery. The salient fact is that the horse was highly vulnerable to missile weapons and since the whole supremacy of the knight was bound up with the horse, it had to be protected. Very few could afford to shield their mounts by any physical means, as is shown by the admiration reserved in the texts for a *couverture* (M.H.G. *kovertiure*).

² See the discussion of this point between young Perceval and the knight who gives him his first lesson in warfare, below.

³ This point seems to have escaped the historians of tactics.

The full implications of the knights' neglect of archery in a competitive military world need a paragraph to themselves. It is impossible to escape the conclusion that it was those elements who were bent on other than purely feudal interests who cultivated the art of archery. Owing to the knight's failure to add proficiency in archery to his other military accomplishments, this indispensable art was practised and hired out to princes and townships by a class of men who had no alternative but to live by hire if they preferred the military life. But the impoverishment of the majority of the knighthood in an age of growing monetary economy forced them to seek financial reward for military services in addition to the fief which was originally considered enough,¹ and their emotional disability to shoot at men must have lessened their value in the market as a caste. By the end of the thirteenth century, well-to-do mercenaries could afford to equip themselves like knights.² The change from barter to a monetary system would no doubt have reduced the knight to the same straits in the end, but his neglect of one of the most effective weapons of the age must surely have accelerated it.³ With the rise of organized archery, however, his fate was also sealed in a purely military sense. Mail gave way to plate, plate grew thicker and thicker, horses, too, were covered in bardings which grew in the same way, until this unphilosophic centaur, once the gayest of creatures, shared the fate of the armed reptiles in sheer inertia. A precarious dominion had come to an end. As one factor among others, the weapon which had always been a threat to the knight and which he had been able partially to suppress and thoroughly to disdain, was turned against him to the full limit of that threat now that the time was ripe, and we begin to hear a military aristocracy cry shame on the horrors of war. But their disapproval of archery is tragic as well as comic. The people who consented to develop the art were not over-long in appearing, and no single instance could better illustrate the military and social situation of the knight than his dilemma with regard to archery. Perhaps this will clarify some of the opinions culled from their own literature, which must now claim our attention.

* * * * *

In the order of history, the discussion between young Perceval and the resplendent knight concerning the lance must come first. The lance was

¹ Schmitthenner, *Europäische Geschichte und Soldnertum* (1933), p. 13.

² Boutaric, *op cit*, p. 151.

³ It is interesting to note, since most of the quotations which follow are from German literature, that Germany was least apt to make use of archery because the country was several generations behind in the development of monetary economy.

still thrown by mailed horsemen at Hastings, but not long afterwards the development of the heavy lance and its tactics made this both undesirable and impossible. Soon only the rabble and wild men threw javelins. To do so amounted to rather low comedy in the eyes of the knight. In Chrétien, Perceval's mother apparels him 'à la guise de Galois' (l. 603), but when he sets out on his journey with three javelins, she takes two of them 'por ce que trop sanblast Galois' (l. 609). It would have made him look *too* wild. Wolfram also makes much of Parzival's javelin: the line 'sin gabylot begunder wegen' (120, 16) on the face of it was intended to have a comic effect, especially since the person he might have aimed it at turns out to be a fully caparisoned knight, whose coat of mail was no doubt as proof against the javelin as Parzival thought the deer would be, if they wore mail (124, 12): but we are reminded that Parzival slew Ither the Red Knight with a javelin, nevertheless, and must regard it as a tragi-comic weapon. Its tragic aspects will be examined in a moment. When Perceval importunes the resplendent knight (whom Wolfram names 'Karnakharnanz') to explain the lance he carries, the latter says. 'ce est ma lance' (l. 297) and the boy persists in his questioning as follows (l. 198 ff.):

'Dites vos' fet il, 'qu'an la lance
 Si con je faz mes javeloz?'
 'Nenil, vaslez, tu es toz soz,
 Einz an fiert an tot demanois.'
 'Donc vaut miauz li uns de cez trois
 Javeloz que vos veez ci;
 Car quanque je vuel an oci,
 Oisiaus et bestes a besong,
 Et si les oci de tant loing
 Con l'an porroit un bozon treire.'
 'Vaslez, de ce n'ai je que feire.'

This wild talk of throwing one's weapons has reminded the knight that they have strayed right away from his purpose, which was to ask if Perceval had seen five knights and three damsels riding that way, and he pulls the boy up sharply. Nevertheless, the historian must answer Perceval with a qualified affirmative: lances used to be thrown, once. Wolfram reserves his judgement of the javelin for a later passage, for the murder of Ither, partly in order to avoid the rather irritating repetition of the varlet's questions to the knight in Chrétien, partly because the word-play is lost in German, but mainly in the general interests of his character: for Parzival learns quickly, if literally, and would never have thrown a javelin at Ither if he had been told it was not done. In saving this up Wolfram removes every suspicion that Parzival could have slain Ither in baseness. As he tells the story Parzival's innocence

is assured. Nevertheless, this does not detract from the tragedy of the deed, which is mourned in the elegy quoted at the beginning of this article, an elegy which may seem not a little absurd to those unversed in the fixed ideas of a warrior caste.

It would have been equally degrading for all concerned if Ither had been slain not by a javelin, but by an arrow. *Le Roman de Girard de Viane*¹ is most explicit here. Four brothers, Girard, Hernaus, Rainier and Mille, together with their father, a knight, are reduced to the level of starvation. The brothers go foraging and fall in with a caravan of Saracen miscreants (p. 7):

Et dist Hernaus: 'Laissiez les approchier,
Que par la crois, que requèrent paumier,
Verraïement ferai-je le premier
Parmi le cors de cest quarrel d'acier.'
... 'A mal eur, dist Girars et Rainier,
S'or devenons comme guarson bersier.'
Mais panre à pois et tuer d'un levier.
L'en nos devroit molt vilment reprohier.
Si devons nous nos vertus essayer.
Cent dehaus ait, qui archiërs fu premier!
Il fu couars, il n'osait aprochier.'

This sentiment is put into Girard's mouth to reveal his heroic temper, but the author has forewarned us in the following terms (p. 6):

Hernaus monta: si fust li plus saichant.
Li trois à pie se vont esbanoiant,
Ars ont tandut et sajètes trenchant,
Que chevalier ne sont pas vouremant.

It would be impossible for a knight to set out in this fashion. Bertrand would not have turned the bow even against miscreants. It was for hunting—*bersier*. And indeed the brothers' bows and arrows are left out of the inventory of their impoverished father's remaining possessions (p. 4):

1 destrier et 1 mule de Suhe,
Et 1111 escus et 111 lances.

The reproach that the archer was a coward and dare not come near recalls Lykus' words in *Herakles Distracted*:

And for such merit am I bound
To spare the sons of Hercules, who gained
A name he deserved not? He was brave
In waging war with beasts, in nought beside,
With his left hand he never did sustain
The shield, nor faced he the protended spear,
But with his bow, that weapon of a dastard,
Was still prepared for flight: such arms afford
No proof of courage.

¹ By Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube, ed. P. Tarbé (1850). Bertrand was a clerk who flourished about 1220 and did not like bloodshed.

The medieval knight was in full agreement with Lykus, but it would have served him better against his Eastern foe to have hearkened to the voice of 'Amphitryon, who replies:

He who bends
With skilful hand the bow, hath this advantage,
Which never fails him: with a thousand shafts
He smites the foe, no danger to himself
Incurring, but securely stands aloof,
And wreaks his vengeance while they gaze around....
For what in war displays
The greatest prudence, is to vex the foe,
Nor rush at random on their pointed spears.

The Asiatic horse-bowmen were near enough to Euripides' country for this debate to be of first-hand political importance. In medieval Japan 'to draw bow on' was an idiom for 'to commence hostilities against' and yet it was considered dastardly to shoot a bonny fighter down from a distance. In the story of the restitution of the House of Oguri¹ it is a recurring trait of the villainous Yokoyama to suggest the use of the bow against the hero Sushekige and his men when they are cornered. Shōji, the doughtiest of the latter, is fighting with an iron pole, in the manner of Wolfram's Rennewart. His enemies withdraw and string their bows. 'Shōji was in a great passion . . . "Cowards! is this to show the courage of the *bushi* ('knight')? Truly none but Kwantō bumpkins have the arms to wield the sword and the guts to use it."' (This seems a little illogical when Shōji himself is using an iron pole.)

For javelins and arrows the gentlemanly warrior has a natural contempt, but it was reserved for the European knight in his peculiar historic situation to set a thorough-going taboo upon them. Girard de Viane told us the bow was fit for varlets to hunt with, Wolfram that the javelin was no weapon for a knight. Others, in strict accordance with the *Waffenrecht*, will relegate them to the lowest rabble. In the *Roman de Parise*² Raymond, Duke of Saint-Gilles, returns to his country after sustaining a signal defeat and is mobbed by the townsmen:

E dient li borjois: 'Damedeu an loon!
Vos n'avez mie erré, certes comme prodon;
Or vos gardetz de nos, que tuit vos desion.'
Il lor giterent pierres et carriax à bandon,
Et li archier lor traient saietes et bojons.

Stones and arrows! Gottfried von Strassburg, a townsman himself, is even more savage in his condemnation of archers. Tristan is about to

¹ *Oguri Hangwan Ichūdanki* (a redaction from the *kōdan* and chronicles of the Japanese originals). Translated by J. de Benneville (1915). A *kōdan*, it must be confessed, is about as reliable evidence of strictly medieval Japanese customs as Sir Walter Scott of European, being a cumulative account passing from one imaginative scribe to another.

² Ed. Guessard, ll. 2363 ff.

land in Dublin for the second time, when the King's marshal hastens up with a band of men 'beidiu der burgaer' unde ir boten' (l. 8739), to see if he were from Cornwall (8748 ff.).

die selben wizenære,
die leiden mortræten,
die manegen mort hæten
begangen mit unschulden¹
ir herren ze hulden,
die komen in die habe gezogen
mit armbrusten und mit bogen
und mit ander wiewer,
also von rehte ein rouphe.

The association of stones and arrows or javelins is not rare. In Konrad's *Trojanerkrieg* we read of *ungefuege steine... und angestliche pfile* (ll. 23600 f.), in *Wigalois* of *guot geschoz, steine vil* (10746); in *Parzival* the *bovel* at Condwiramur's beleaguered castle consist of *slingære, patellerie, atgerschutzen*, while the merchants bear javelins (183, 5 ff.); in the Magic Castle on the Magic Bed Gawan is peppered with bolts and pebbles (568, 20 ff.) (the pebbles are omitted in *Diu Krone*, 20709 ff.), the moral being that only a faultless man could survive such shameful treatment, as *Diu Krone* is careful to say (20598 f.):

Wan er aller schanden bar
Was gewesen unze dar.

The phrase *angestliche pfile* is a significant one. Knights were not the men to be squeamish about wounds. Arrows from long range it is true would not pierce the mail, but cross-bow bolts caused fearful abrasions beneath it and an arrow from short range was much to be feared. The archery of the Saracens in particular had made a deep impression on Wolfram and Wirnt, from hearsay. Wirnt is not ashamed to confess his anxiety in the first person when he comes to describe the archery of Wigalois' half-oriental army, accurately enough referred to as *riter*, for even Saladin used to bear a bow (10678 ff.):

zwei tusent riter uz erwelt
huoten hinden nach dem her;
die vuorten vreislliche wer:
tusent schutzen mit starken bogen.
swenne die wurden uf gezogen
und man die vinde komen sach,
so wær min lip da ze schwach
ze riten under in gewesen:
ich wæn unlange wære genesen.

Wolfram has some scathing words for the nervousness of the knights who defect from Willehalm's army, underlining the difference between

¹ *mit unschulden* of course refers to the murdered.

serious warfare against the Saracen horse-archer and make-believe at a tournament (*Willehalm*, 321, 16):

si namen urloup an der stat
und jahan, bi ir ziten
in turnei und in striten
mohten si da heime behalden pris:
si enwolden neimens terkis
da sin deheime wile,
daz iemen sine phile
in si da dorfte stecken.

They were of the opinion (323, 30) that:

toren solden striten
mit so manegen Sarrazinen:
'wir suh uz disen pinen,
da wir gemach vinden groz.
ja sint der Sarrazine geschoz
geluppet sam diu natern biz.'
si wolden, daz kein bilwiz¹
si da schuzze durch diu knie.

Whereas Wirnt makes great play with archery—and elephants of war—as local oriental colour in the final battle of *Wigalois*, Wolfram shows a real grasp of the essential tactics of the Saracen mounted archer. He is sufficiently able to repress his own knightly feelings to depict how the great Terramer was armed with bow and quiver by the King of Morocco, though he cannot bring himself to show the hero making active use of them (*Willehalm*, 357, 1 ff.). He records how the Christians lose many men before the battle is joined (344, 27 ff.).

disu her waren herrenlos.
die kristenheit von in verlos
manegen ritter, e der sturm ergienec.

Herrenlos must refer to the Parthian tactics of breaking up into small bands which ranged the flanks of the enemy whilst pouring in deadly showers of arrows without waiting to sustain a charge. In this passage Wolfram does not mention archery explicitly but an earlier passage in *Willehalm* makes it abundantly clear that it was by arrow-fire that the men were lost (18, 15 ff.):

an der selben zite
des hebens an dem strite
sine tukopel phlagen.
die da gestreut lagen,
swie si heten in gezogen
mit kunste manegen starken bogen,

¹ This sardonic jest must have brought guffaws from Wolfram's audience, since kobolds were supposed to cause rheumatism and lumbago by shooting arrows at the part to be affected. In Old English charms, too, witches were held to shoot their maladies at their victims.

ir lazen und ir ziehen,
 ir wenken und ir vliehen
 wart in gar vergolden,
 sit muosten unde solden
 die getouften wer bieten.

This is a truly remarkable passage and Wolfram must have had his information from a campaigner in the East, unlike the purely literary colouring of the First Book of *Parzival*. It was the policy of the Saracen to offer no target for a charge until their incessant sweeping movements with arrow-fire had so harassed the enemy that he would fall an easy prey to an attack with lance and scimitar. Wolfram's phrase *ir wenken und ir vliehen* would serve as a translation of the Arabic *karr wa farr*, 'charging and fleeing', the phrase with which they rendered their own tactics.¹ Wolfram's grasp of facts, for all his unbridled fantasy, is well brought out on comparison with a parallel in *Wigalois* (10834):

die kunden entwichen unde sten.

The reference is to elephants, each with over sixty sergeants on its back.²

From these last pages it is clear that the very knights who made it their pleasant duty to raise the standards of their fellows by portraying paragons of chivalrous virtues, among them a high disdain of missile weapons, were astonishingly aware of the havoc these arms could create in the ranks of warriors who bound themselves to another kind of warfare, to the charge of heavy cavalry, which they glorified in its most personal form on every occasion that offered. One of these knights, Wolfram von Eschenbach, even had something of a general's appreciation of how these despised yet fearful weapons were best used. Is it too much to suppose that beneath their prejudice against cultivating the art of archery for themselves they knew *why* it should be discouraged as far as possible in others?

A. T. HATTO.

LONDON.

¹ These tactics still held good with rifle-fire in the desert, as *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom* will show. *Parzival*, 386, 4 ff. shows some knowledge of the tactics of *Willehalm*:

da muozen beidiu liute und ors
 von geschutze liden pine,
 da die Kahetune*
 unt die sarjande von Semblidac
 ieslicher smer kunste pflac:
 turcople kunden wenken...

* Cf 351, 12, 'Turkople von Kaheti'.

² On the other hand, Wirtz has a detail which is well observed (11113 ff.). 'vil schoener rosse lac da erslagen: dar uz sach man die schefte ragen und manger hande zeme, groz unde kleine.' A chronicler of Damascus likened the dead horses after a rout of the Crusaders to hedgehogs.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

A NOTE ON 'THE OWL AND THE NIGHTINGALE'

The inference to be drawn from certain lines of *The Owl and the Nightingale*, viz.

þat underyat þe King Henri:
Jesus his soule do merci! (ll. 1091-2)

has been keenly debated of late. Dr H. B. Hinckley (*Mod. Phil.* xvii, 247 ff.; *P.M.L.A.* xlv, 329 ff.) and Dr K. Huguinir (*O. and N.* pp. 76 ff.; *Anglia*, lxxiii, 113-24) maintain that the allusion does not necessarily imply that Henry II was already dead when the poem was written. Miss L. de la Torre Bueno (*Anglia*, lviii, 122-30) and Professor F. Tupper (*P.M.L.A.* xlix, 406-27), on the other hand, hold that it can only be interpreted as a pious prayer for the soul of the monarch already deceased. The point is obviously one of importance in assigning a date to the poem.

Some further light on this vexed problem would seem to be afforded by *A Lollard Tract· On Translating the Bible into English* (c. 1407), recently edited by C. F. Buhler and included in *Medium Aevum*, vii, 167-83. The relevant passage is as follows:

It is knowen to many men þat in þe tyme of kyng Richerd, *whos soule God asoile*, into a parlment was put a bille . . . to anulle þe Bibel þat tyme translatid into Engliche . . . ; wiche wanne it was seyn of lordes and comouns, þe good duke of Lancastre Jon, *whos soule God asoile for his mercy*, answered þerto scharpely . . . Also þe bischope of Caunturbiri, Thomas Arrundel *þat nowe is*, seide a sermon in Westminster þer as weren many hundred puple at þe biryng of quene Anne, *of whos soule God haue mercy*, and in his comendynges of hir he seide: it was more joie of hir þan of any woman þat euere he knewe, ffor . . . sche hadde on Engliche al þe foure Gospeleris . . . (ll. 277-97).

Here, it is clear, the phrase *whos soule God asoile* is consistently employed (with slight variations) by one writing (c. 1407) in referring to personages already deceased (Richard II, d. 1399; John Duke of Lancaster, d. 1399; Queen Anne, d. 1394). Equally significant, however, is the omission of the phrase in connexion with 'bischope' Arundel (d. 1414) then still living, and the employment of the phrase *þat nowe is* in its stead. The omission can scarcely have been due to a failure of charity on the part of the writer! The obvious intention was surely to distinguish between the dead and the living. Hence at this date the phrase *whos soule God asoile* must be regarded as the conventional accompaniment of references to the departed, and to the departed only. And in all probability the

same convention at an earlier stage is represented in the reference to Henry II in *The Owl and the Nightingale*, which must therefore be interpreted as an 'ejaculated' prayer for the king after death. Such an interpretation would also be in keeping with the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.¹

J. W. H. ATKINS.

ABERYSTWYTH.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE MIDDLE ENGLISH ROMANCE
'YWAINE AND GAWIN'

The poem is found in one manuscript only—Cotton MS. Galba E ix, which is now in the British Museum. The manuscript, which is a miscellaneous volume, belongs to the early part of the fifteenth century. The poem has been edited twice. The first edition is to be found in Joseph Ritson's *Ancient English Metrical Romances* (1802). The text, as transcribed by Ritson, is fairly accurate, but many minor inaccuracies are to be found, some of which are, no doubt, printer's errors. The poem has been edited more recently by Gustav Schleich (Oppeln, 1887), but copies of this edition are very rare. Critical notes on Schleich's edition appeared in *Englische Studien*, 12. 83, 15. 429; 24. 146; *Anglia*, 12. 479; 14. 319.

All the readings and emendations given below are suggested independently—some apparently for the first time.

I. Ll. 186–90.

Bot a burde hang vs biforn
Was nowther of yren ne of tre
Ne j ne wist wharof it might be
And by þat bord hang a mall.
Þe knyght smate on þarwithall....

The word 'burde' ('bord') is a literal translation of the French word 'table', which in this context means 'gong':

¹ On this theological question, debated by previous writers, Monsignor Philip Hallett kindly writes as follows: The words 'Jesus his soule do merci' are incontrovertible evidence that King Henry was dead. They are parallel to the words so often seen on medieval brasses 'cujus animae propicietur Deus'—it is abbreviated CĪS ÆE P̄PICIETUR or something similar. I have never known such words used of the living. Not only are the dead in a more pitiable plight than the living (unless they are already in heaven), as being unable to help themselves, but the use of the word 'soul' would be understood by every Catholic to imply that the man was dead. When John Smith is alive we ask prayers for John Smith, not for his soul. After death his body is in the grave and we pray for his soul. Our teaching is that man is body *and* soul. The soul alone is not really man, it is in some way maimed and imperfect after the death of the body. That is the philosophical basis of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. (The words used by a judge in condemning a prisoner to death are no real exception, for they are used in anticipation of imminent death—'Your body is to be hanged, and God have mercy on your soul.')
Editor.

Pandoit une table; ce cunt
Qu'il n'i avoit ne fer ne fust
Ne rien qui de cuivre ne fust.
Sor cele table d'un martel
Qui panduz iert a un postel
Feri li ravassors trois cos.

(*Yvain*, ll. 214-19.)

W. Foerster (*Der Lowenritter (Yvain)*, ed. W. Foerster, Halle, 1887) in a note to line 214 translates 'table' as 'ein Gong'.

N.E.D. wrongly gives as the meaning of 'burde' ('bord'): 'a tablet upon which public notices are written or affixed'.

II. Ll. 648-50.

MS. And feyned þam noght forto fight;
Þair hauberkes þat men myght ken
Þe blode out of þair bodyes ren.

The text here appears to be corrupt. There is a similarity between the phrasing of this scene and that of the later battle-scene, ll. 3529 ff. Of special importance are ll. 3543-4 and ll. 3551-2.

In many stedes might men ken
Þe blode out of þair bodies ren. (3543-4.)
Þair hauberkes als war al to-torn,
Both bihind and als byforn. (3551-2.)

A comparison with these lines suggests that the scribe has made a mistake in copying and has missed out a whole line and two half-lines. He would probably not be following the meaning of the poem, and on glancing back at his original would mistake the '-es' ending of 'stedes' for that of 'hauberkes' which he had just written and so continue—'þat men myght ken'. Emend to:

And feyned þam noght forto fight;
Þair hauberkes als war al to-torn,
Both bihind and als byforn,
In many stedes, þat men myght ken
Þe blode out of þair bodyes ren.

III. Ll. 1457-65:

Þat knyght es nothing to set by
Þat leues al his cheualry,
And ligges bekeand in his bed,
When he haues a lady wed;
For when þat he has grete endose,
Þan war tyme to win his lose,
For when a knyght es cheualrouse,
His lady es þe more ielows,
Also sho lufes him wele þe bet.

N.E.D. gives no meaning for the word 'endose'. The French original gives little help:

'Comant? Seroiz vos or de caus',
 Ce li dist mes sire Gauvains,
 'Qui por leur fames valent mains?
 Honiz soit de sainte Marie,
 Qui por anpirier se marie!
 Amander doit de bele dame,
 Qui l'a a amie ou a fame,
 Si n'est puis droiz que ele l'aïnt,
 Que ses los et ses pris remaint.
 Certes ancor seroiz iriez
 De s'amor, se vos anpirez;
 Que fame a tost s'amor reprise....'

(*Yvain*, ll. 2484 ff.)

The word 'endose' is evidently the same as French 'endosse' (en dos) for which Littré gives: 'toute la peine, toute la responsabilité de quelque chose'. Translate 'great responsibility', 'great things under his protection'.

IV. Ll. 3613-15:

MS. For nowþer of þam wald oþer spar.
 For mirk night þai þan namar,
 Þarfor to rest þai both þam zelde.

L. 3614 is evidently corrupt. At a first glance the easiest way out of the difficulty would seem to be to emend 'night' to 'might' and regard 'mirk' as a noun. However, a study of the French original shows that 'night' is correct:

Longuemant ainsi se reposent;
 Que rasanbler as armes n'osent.
 N'ont plus de la bataille cure
 Que por la nuit qui vient obscure
 Que por ce que mout s'antredotent.

(*Yvain*, ll. 6219-23.)

Three other emendations are possible:

- (i) Emend 'þan' to 'can', used absolutely, as often in Middle English.
- (ii) Emend 'þan' to 'wan' = 'fought'. This emendation provides a rather abrupt transition from l. 3613, but can be better justified on paleographical grounds. It may be that the original had the rune 'p' = 'w', and the copyist, not recognising this rare symbol, simply wrote the better-known symbol 'p' = 'th'. However, it is doubtful whether the old runic symbol for 'w' would still be in use when the original was written. It is known that it continued to be used occasionally until the end of the thirteenth century, but the poem under discussion belongs to the fourteenth century.

(iii) Insert 'might' after 'night'. It is quite possible that the copyist, on looking back at his original, owing to the similarity of the two words, passed over the word 'might', thinking that he had already copied it. This last emendation seems to be the best.

WILFRED LISTER.

MANCHESTER.

'BRONSTROPS.' A NOTE ON 'A FAIRE QUARRELL'

The curious slang word *Bronstrops*, meaning a bawd or whore, which occurs repeatedly in Middleton and Rowley's *A Faire Quarrell*¹ as part of the roaring vocabulary, and which is found again in *A Cure for a Cuckold*² by Webster and Rowley (and perhaps Heywood³), has not yet been explained satisfactorily.

The word occurs in the 1617 edition of *A Faire Quarrell*⁴ and in the same scenes in the new edition of 1622.⁵ Besides this, it turns up again in the extra scene advertised on the title-page of a re-issue of 1617 as 'With new Additions of Mr. *Chaugh*s and *Trimtrams* Roaring, and the Bauds Song'. Compass in *A Cure for a Cuckold*,⁶ when he says of a whore:

A *Tweak*, or *Bronstrops*, I learnt that name in a Play
is clearly referring back to *A Faire Quarrell*, and we may be fairly certain that that play first brought the word on to the stage. The Bawd's reference to elegant names for her profession in the 1617 re-issue of *A Faire Quarrell*.⁷

Baud, and Whore? out you vnprofitable raskall, hast not thou beene at the new Play yet, to teach thee better manners: . . . Baud and Whore is not mention'd amongst 'um, but the handsomest narrow-mouth'd names they haue for vs, . . .

points, presumably, to the version from which she actually speaks.⁸

¹ 1617, Sigs. G2v, I1r, I2r, I3v, I4r, the extra scene occurs in three inserted leaves, sig H4 (ex.) and foll.

² 1661, Sig. Flr.

³ Cf. H. D. Gray, "'A Cure for a Cuckold'" by Heywood, Rowley and Webster', *M.L.R.*, 1927, vol. xxii, pp. 389-97.

⁴ The play was probably performed after March of that year: cf. M. W. Sampson, *Masterpieces of the English Drama*, 1915, p. 202.

⁵ This edition possibly followed another production of the play. Cf. Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, 1891, II, p. 98, who identifies *A Vowe and a Good One*, acted on 6 January 1622/3 by the Prince's Servants, with the present play.

⁶ This play was not published until 1661. F. L. Lucas, summarizing the evidence for its date in *The Complete Works of John Webster*, 1927, III, pp. 3-4, puts it after mid-1624 or at the beginning of 1625.

⁷ Sig. H4r (ex.)

⁸ The word is probably due to Rowley, the relevant scenes are commonly attributed to him. With regard to *A Faire Quarrell*, cf. P. G. Wiggan, *An Enquiry into the Authorship of the Middleton-Rowley Plays*, 1897, pp. 34-5, 38-9; E. N. S. Thompson, 'Elizabethan dramatic collaboration', *Englische Studien*, 1909, XL, p. 44; H. D. Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 395-6. For *A Cure for a Cuckold*, cf. F. L. Lucas, *op. cit.*, III, p. 16; H. D. Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 395-6; C. W. Stork, *William Rowley*, 1910, pp. 62-3: though both Lucas and H. D. Sykes, *Notes and Queries*, ser. II, IX, 1914, suggest Webster's presence too in this scene, they imply that the slang word was carried over by Rowley from his previous work.

The *N.E.D.*, quoting the examples I have given, suggests that the word is a further corruption of *bawstrop*, an already corrupted form of *bawdstrot*, which is traced back to O F. *baudetrot*, earlier *baldestrot* or *baudestrot*, possibly formed from *bald*, 'bold', and the Teutonic *strut*. Examples of *bawdstrot*, 'a bawd', are given from *Piers Plowman*¹ and from vocabularies, the latest being dated 1483. (The *N.E.D.* is misleading in saying the word is 'frequent in Middleton's comedies', as it occurs only in one play, and also in inferring it always means a bawd; though the distinction is made between *tweak* and *bronstrops*, *whore* and *bawd*, at sigs. I2r and possibly H4v of *A Faire Quarrell*, elsewhere the meaning is ambiguous.)

A still earlier use of *bronstrops*, which has not been noticed before, suggests an alternative derivation. In John Weever's *Epigrammes* of 1599,² Epigram 7 of the third week, entitled *Ad fatorum dominum*, consists of a torrent of obscure and often nonsensical classical allusions, chiefly mythological, mocking perhaps a rival;³ and the first four lines run as follows.

Hence *Braurons* god to *Taurominion*,
And you leualting *Corybants* be gone,
Fly thundering *Bronsterops* to *Hippocrene*,
And *Mauors* to Nymph-nursing *Mytilene*, . . .

The following piece of dialogue from *A Faire Quarrell*⁴ suggests that the word may have been taken from the epigram:

Chau. Tutor, Tutor, ere you goe any further, tell mee the English of that, what is a *Bronsterops* pray.

Se (cond Usher). A *Bronsterops* is in English a *Hippocrene*.

Chau. A *Hippocrene*, note it Trim. I loue to vnderstand the English as I goe.

Trim. Whats the English of *Hippicrene*

Chau. Why *Bronsterops*.

Here again *Bronsterops* and *Hippocrene* are juxtaposed for no apparent reason. The spelling *Bronsterops* beside *Bronstrops* and the occurrence of Minotaur in both play and epigram are minor points; the significance lies in the similar method of collecting recondite classical words.

The word as used by Weever is as pointless as it is obscure, and seems to have no reference to the cant name for a bawd. Since its justification seems to be its mythological association, I would suggest that it might

¹ A. III. 42. (MS. H.)

² Sigs D2v-D3r. R. B. McKerrow, ed. *Epigrammes*, 1911, vi, etc., thinks most of the epigrams were written between 1597 and 1598; there is no *S R.* entry, and no later edition until 1911. Cf. also R. E. Shear, 'New Facts about Henry Porter', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 1927, XLII, pp. 647-9.

³ A. Davenport, 'John Weever's Epigrammes, and the Hall-Marston Quarrel', *Review of English Studies*, 1935, XI, p. 68, suggests Weever is here taking Marston's part against Hall.

⁴ Sig. G2v.

be a compound, perhaps made by Weever himself, of the names Brontes and Steropes, two of the Cyclops (the third being Arges or Pyracmon) who served Vulcan in his forge. The epithet *thundering* makes this more likely, since the names mean respectively Thunder, Lightning and Sheet-lightning. It is true that the compound is indefensible in Greek, but Weever's epigram is not linguistically serious, and in the two plays concerned the word is used quite arbitrarily. In *A Faire Quarrell*, *Cyclops* is used side by side with *Bronstrops* in a slang sense; there might be a connexion of meaning here, or simply an association of sound.

Brontes and Steropes appear often enough in contemporary literature, usually as a conventional pair. Their history is given in the rationalistic mythologies known to the Elizabethans and Jacobeans, notably the *Mythologiae* of Natalis Comes,¹ Boccaccio's *Genealogiæ deorum gentium*,² and Lilus Giraldu's *De Deis Gentium*.³ Moreover, Virgil mentions them in Book 8 of the *Aeneid*, which would be accessible both in the original and in Phaer's translation:⁴

The gĩantes in y^e caue of wydnes wast their tooles did plye
Pyragmon naked-lymmd, & Steropes, & Brontes hye.

More suggestive perhaps is John Eliot's use of these names in *Ortho-Epna Gallica*,⁵ since the mood of The Bragger is not unlike that of Weever's epigram:

I rage, Duels I rage, hold me Duels, hold me. Ho Caetzo great Duel of hell,
awake thy sleepe Cyclopes: Thou Vulcan who lumpest with thy cosins Asteropes,
Brontes, Steropes, Polyphemus and Pyracmon. I will set you a worke. I giue my
selfe to an hundred pipes of old Duels, in case that if you will not fight, if I do not
make you eate the two egges of Proserpina.

and reminds us also of the tone of the roaring school in *A Faire Quarrell*. Besides these instances, there are references to the pair between the dates of Weever and the plays, notably in Dekker's *Newes from Hell*⁶ (a metaphorical use), and Thomas Heywood's *Troia Britanica*.⁷

This suggested derivation does not entirely rule out the possibility of a combination of old and new words in *A Faire Quarrell*, nor does the fact that we cannot trace a connexion between the last use of *baldestrot* in 1483 and the first appearance of *bronsterops* in 1599. The writer in the play might be taking over Weever's pseudo-classical word with a glance at the old word for a bawd, and it would then fall into line with *fucus*, *fructifer* and *panagron*, used in the roaring school in a quibbling sense. Even if

¹ 1551, p. 153.

² 1531, C. xvi.

³ 1565, p. 352.

⁴ *The Nyne fyrst Bookes of the Eneidos*, 1562, Sig. Bb3r.

⁵ 1593, Sig. S2r.

⁶ 1606, Sig. A4r.

⁷ 1609, Canto 5, v. 91; Canto 13, v. 47.

the word were to prove meaningless, however, the humour of other ostentatious but senseless words like *Calcut* and *Sindicus*, to learn which Chough pays so heavily, is explanation enough of its inclusion in the play.

However we explain *bronstrops*, its mock-classical setting must be attributed partly to the light-hearted attitude to mythology encouraged by such English imitations of Comus and others as Stephen Bateman's *The Golden Booke of the Leaden Goddess* (1577) and Richard Linche's *The Fountaine of Ancient Fiction* (1599), besides Bacon's later and more scientific *De sapientia veterum*;¹ and the slang use of the word falls in the same category as the burlesque play, the comic construe and the casual modernization of mythology in domestic fiction and satire, examples of which are numerous at the time when Middleton and Rowley were writing. This deliberate perverting of classical allusions adds point to verbal humour which is otherwise commonplace enough.

MARGERY FISHER.

LONDON.

'WARTON' ON THE ROWLEY PAPERS

Mr Howard P. Vincent, in his article in *Modern Language Review* (October 1939, pp. 572-5), prints the letter signed 'Tho. Warton' as if it were by the author of the *History of English Poetry*, instead of by Thomas Wharton, the close friend and correspondent of Gray. The address, 'Old Park near Darlington', indicates its real author. Though the contents of the letter have no bearing on Thomas Warton's views of Chatterton, they have on Thomas Wharton's, and are interesting even more for what they say about Wharton's views on Gray.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

RABELAIS'S EDITION OF THE 'APHORISMS' OF HIPPOCRATES

The reputation of Rabelais as a serious scholar rests on a small volume published by Gryphius in 1532 and containing translations of the *Aphorisms*, the *Presages*, the *De natura humana* and the *De ratione victus in morbis acutis* of Hippocrates and the *Ars Medicinalis* of Galen. These translations are not by Rabelais himself: the *Aphorisms* and *Ars Medicinalis* are by Leonicensus, the *Presages* and the *De ratione* by Cop, and the

¹ For a discussion of this attitude, with a full bibliography, cf. Douglas Bush, *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry*, 1932, pp. 32, 60, 288, etc.

De natura humana by Andrea Brentino. Rabelais's role was that of editor. He had in his possession a Greek manuscript of parts of Hippocrates for which he claims the twin virtues of age and unimpeachable clarity. While lecturing at Montpellier he had used this to check the Latin translations current among his pupils and had discovered them to be incomplete and incorrect. He then embodied the result of his observations in a set of notes; and the following year, while he was at Lyons, Stephanus Gryphius saw these notes and suggested their incorporation in a pocket edition of Hippocrates. Rabelais was annoyed by the smallness of the proposed format which meant that his remarks had to be fitted into a very small space, but, pressed by Gryphius, he consented. He took as the basis of his work an edition of the relevant parts of Hippocrates which Colines had published in 1524.¹ It was decided to reprint this and then to add Rabelais's notes in the form of interpolation and marginal comment; and Rabelais's Greek text of the *Aphorisms* according to his much vaunted manuscript was printed as an appendix. There his labours ended, and had it not been for *Pantagruel* they would have been completely forgotten.

The purpose of this paper is to examine these fruits of Rabelais's editing, not over the whole book but in the case of the most important part of it, the *Aphorisms*; and to see what light they can shed on Rabelais's mind, learning and methods. There are 200 notes and emendations scattered over the seven books of the *Aphorisms*. The first point to note is that 71 of these consist of isolated Greek words or phrases quoted directly from the text. Wherever Rabelais is dissatisfied with the Latin translation and cannot find a better one, he quotes the Greek. That accounts for over a third of the notes. The rest are in Latin, or in Greek and Latin, the Greek part consisting always of a quotation from the text. They fall into two sections according to subject-matter. First of all, there are the emendations which Rabelais made on the authority of his manuscript. This contained sixteen complete aphorisms (v, 51; vii, 21, 62, 63, 66, 67, 68, 72, 83, 85-91), as well as parts of aphorisms (iv, 62, v, 59), and single words (iv, 35, 42, 45, 64; v, 20, 33, 41, 42; vi, 7, 31, 32; vii, 49) which did not appear in the 1524 translation.² Also in five cases it gave a different reading and so necessitated an alternative rendering in the margin (i, 46; iii, 21; iv, 21; v, 22; vi, 22). Now three of the five alternative renderings, five of the twelve words added as well as portions

¹ This was shown to be so in a paper by M. René Sturel published in the *Revue des Etudes Rabelaisiennes*, t. 6.

² Other editions of Leoniceus's translation however contain i, 66, 67, 68, very much in the form in which they appear in Rabelais's volume.

of the Latin versions of the complete aphorisms, were taken from the translation of the *Aphorisms* by Theodore Gaza. But these emendations form only a small proportion of the notes. The majority are concerned with improving Leoniceus's translation on points where his text is irreproachable. They consist of alternative renderings mostly of single words or short phrases; there are ninety-two of these and sixty-seven are taken from Gaza (I, 3, 4 (two notes), 7, 12, 13, 17, 22, 23 (two notes), 24; II, 4, 6, 13, 20, 27, 36, 44, 46; III, 7 (two notes), 9, 11, 12 (two notes), 18 (two notes), 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30 (three notes); IV, 6, 14, 18, 42, 47, 68; V, 15, 18, 20, 22, 33, 43, 58, 62, 63, 65, 72; VI, 5, 11, 13, 28, 44, 53, 54; VII, 8, 11, 16, 25, 52, 58). The debt is acknowledged only in one out of every three cases. Of the remaining twenty-five notes, nine are taken from the commentaries of Celsus (III, 31, IV, 11, 52, 53, 83; V, 13, 37, 53; VI, 27). Sixteen are presumably original. Apart from these, there are two explanatory notes (V, 47 which gives a description of some bandages and VI, 44 on *ileos*) of which Celsus provides one: and there are two references to Galen in the first section;¹ so that out of a hundred and twenty-nine Latin notes and emendations, seventy-five are taken from Gaza and some four others carry the marks of his influence.² To sum up, out of a total of two hundred notes, a hundred and fifty-six are straightforward quotations which owe nothing to Rabelais himself, and they all come from three sources: seventy-one are from his Greek text and are given in Greek, seventy-five from Gaza's translation, and ten from Celsus. Only forty-four, not quite one-quarter, can Rabelais claim to be in any degree his work.

So much for the origin of these annotations. Their general character should be obvious from what has been already said. With the four exceptions mentioned, they are either translations of parts of the text omitted by Leoniceus or alternative renderings. It was unfortunate for Rabelais that the space at his disposal was too small to allow him to add his own comments and to state why he preferred one Latin word to another; for many of his suggestions appear uninformative and even fatuous without an explanation. But even this meagre material is sufficient to show us on what principle Rabelais set about his work. He had a double purpose. As a medical writer, he conscientiously aimed at providing a correct translation of the technicalities in his author. Leoniceus has a tendency to slur several Greek words under a single

¹ I, 22 and 27. I have not included these in my totals as they do not stand alone but are joined to renderings taken from Gaza.

² Some of Rabelais's translations of the aphorisms omitted by Leoniceus contain words and turns of construction borrowed from Gaza.

Latin term. At one point he uses 'siccus' to cover both *αἰχμός* and its compounds and *ἀνυδρος* (beginning of section III). Rabelais takes the trouble to mark each separate instance and to substitute Gaza's word 'squalor' wherever 'siccus' translates *αἰχμός*. The only two explanatory notes he includes deal with the meaning of medical terms; and he gives an alternative name for all out-of-the-way diseases (*vide* III, 30· 'deliria' for 'phrenetides', 'bilares' for 'cholerae', 'mariscaes' for 'haemorrhoides'). But this concern for correct translation explains only about half of his notes. His main purpose is to bring the original Greek before the reader's mind. It is this naive humanist enthusiasm for the language as such which makes him so often content himself just with quoting a Greek word. Where Leoniceus writes 'qui crescunt' (I, 14), he adds in the margin τὰ αὐξανόμενα to show that the Greek used a neuter; and in one instance where Leoniceus for the sake of variety translates the same Greek word occurring twice by two separate Latin ones, Rabelais restores the original form of the sentence. Leoniceus had written 'a longo profluvio habitus, vomitus morbum solvit' (v, 15). Rabelais changed the second 'morbum' to 'profluvium'. In another instance, his desire to keep close to the Greek persuades him to quote a rendering by Gaza which is bad Latin. The Greek runs: τοῖς μὴ κατὰ λόγον κουφίζουσι, οὐ δὲ πιστεύειν (II, 27). This Leoniceus had translated correctly as 'his qui non ex ratione levius se habent, non oportet fidere'; but Rabelais, in his anxiety to keep the superficial form of the original, preferred Gaza· 'his quae non ex ratione levant', and never questions the intransitive use of 'levare'.

The Greek text and notes show all the faults common to the second-rate editions of the period: incorrect accents, incorrect breathings and a host of minor inaccuracies such as προσκύπτων for προσκόπτων and περήγλισχρα for περίγλισχρα (IV, 53). Sometimes the translation omits words which are in the text (I, 17), and sometimes it disagrees with the text altogether. This is the case in I, 5· πᾶν γὰρ τὸ ἀμάρτημα ὃ ἂν γίνηται, μέγα γίνηται (*sic*) μᾶλλον ἐν τῇσι λεπτήσι ἢ ἐν τῇσιν ὀλίγον ἀδροτέρησι διαίτησιν. In spite of this punctuation, the translation runs as follows: 'quaecumque enim error committitur magnus, maior in hoc fit quam in paulo pleniore victu.' According to the text the 'magnus' should belong to the principal clause, so that Gaza's version is nearer the mark: 'quidquid nam committitur, gravius obvenit quam in aliquantulum pleniore.'

These inaccuracies, together with the lack of originality, suggest that the edition was prepared in a hurry and more superficially than the introduction would have us think. On the other hand, there are no

serious errors, but rather many obvious attempts at correct translation; and Rabelais's own renderings of the aphorisms he added show considerable finesse. The impression of superficiality is in part due to the unfortunate brevity of the notes, for which the format is to blame; and even if the Hippocrates makes us question Rabelais's knowledge, it cannot leave us in any doubt about his enthusiasm for Greek. The introduction already suggests that he considers the language a panacea for all ills textual or educational, and the form taken by his notes confirms this impression; but somehow, in the absence of wide knowledge, such enthusiasm possesses an amateurish naiveté.

R. R. BOLGAR.

CAMBRIDGE.

LEXICOGRAPHICAL NOTES

'OÍSLÓ'

Habent sua fata verba, as well as *libelli*; and among the many words born from the fecundity of the Spanish mind, its quick observation and salty humour, yet prodigally discarded, so that now they are a puzzle even to the cultured, there is the curious term *oíslo*, with the meaning of 'wife'. It deserves a regretful remembrance as well as a decent obituary.

Here, to begin with, is the record of its comparatively brief career, or as much of it as can be gathered from the vast morgue of the printed texts:

1. Napolitana (to her husband): Oíslo, ¿quien es aquella mujer que anda por allí? (Francisco Delicado, *Retrato de la Lozana Andaluza*, 1528, ed. Lara, p. 30).
2. Tía (of Rampín, to her husband): ¿Oíslo? vení á sentáos (*sic*) junto á esa señora, que os tiene amor, y quiere que os asentéis cabe ella. Viejo: Si hare de buen grado (*loc. cit.*, p. 45).
3. [A criminal, being whipped through 'las acostumbradas', to a bystander who addressed him:] Oíslo, hombre de bien, quando á vos os azotaren id vos á vuestro placer si quisiéredes, agora dexáme á mí ir al mío (*Los quatro libros del Cortesano*, compuestos en italiano por el Conde Balthasar Castellón y agora nuevamente traducidos en lengua castellana por Boscán, 1534, ed. A. M. Fabié, Madrid, 1873, p. 221).
4. No creo os será nuevo el marido decir a la muger, aunque esté en compañía de muchas mugeres, para llamarla, decille:—¿Oíslo? Y lo mismo ella á él, como si fuese él solo ó ella el que solo lo oye, y no más de á una que lo dice el ¿Oíslo? (*Carta de las setenta y dos necedades*, ap. Paz y Melia, *Salas españolas*, II, 74).
5. Eufemia (to Ximena): ¿Qué te mandó tu señor anoche antes que se fuese a acostar?—¿Oíslo, Ximena de Peñalosa? (Rueda, *Obras*, ed. Cotarelo [*Com. Eufemia*], I, 17).
6. Pascual: ¿Inés García! ¿oíslo?—Inés: Ya os tengo oído; ¿qué queréis?... (*loc. cit.* [*Com. Armelina*], I, 97).
7. Pascual: ¡Suso! que es medio día; entrad, oíslo, á hacer levantar ese mozo, y començen [á] andar esos fuelles (*loc. cit.* [*Com. Armelina*], I, 104).

8. Toruvio (to wife and daughter): Pues decí agora: ¿ qué os terná aparejado de comer la señora de mi mujer? ¡ Así mala rabia la mate! 'Oíslo! ¡ Mochacha Menciguela! ¿ Si todos duermen en Zamora? ¡ Águeda de Toruégano! ¡ Oíslo! (*loc. cit.* [*Paso séptimo*], II, 217).
9. Y luego en entrando allí en el çaguan [Mercurio], se topó con Socrates philosopho, que estaua solitario. Al qual como vio descalço, e vna muy raida hoga y rota, pensando que sería algun hombre de por ay comun y baxo, fuese para él con su gesto como él le tenia, muy hermoso, e vna presencia al parecer más que humana. Oyslo (dixo), ce, buen hombre, dónde estan aquellos con quien los hombres se hazen doctos y virtuosos? (Augustín de Almacán, *La moial e muy graciosa historia del Momo*: compuesta en latín [por León Baptista Alberti] Tradladada en Castellano... Alcalá de Henares, 1553, ap. F. Rodríguez Marín, nueva ed. crít. del *Quijote*, I, 251, n.).
10. Felisero, criado (to Alfénisa, one of the two strumpets):— ¿ Oíslo, señora mia? / Habéis visto aquí un señor?
11. Gonçalves (to his wife): Oysla, Marimendres? Donde estays, muger de bueno? (Timoneda, *Aucto del Castillo de Emaus*, ed. M. E. Johnson [from *Ternario Sacramental*, 1575], Iowa City, 1933, p. 17).
12. Penca Rucia (commenting on a letter from his wife): Mi muger digos de vero / sin porfias / quella jamas en sus dias / virtuoso me llamo. Auctor: Sino como? Penca: Oys lo / penca rucia... The answer which the 'auctor' writes for Penca Rucia to his wife begins with. Oyslo. oyslo. oyslo, written increasingly large (Timoneda, *Aucto del Nacimiento*, Introito, Llabrés manuscript)
13. Llegado a casa, comienza desde la puerta a dezir a su muger: Oíslo, Quiteria Ruiz? toma estos huevos... (Seb. Mey, *Fabulario* [1613], ap. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orig. de la novela*, IV, 144).
14. De esa manera—respondió Sancho Panza—, si ya fuese rey por algún milagro de los que vuestra merced dice, por lo menos Juana Gutiérrez mi oíslo vendría a ser reina, y mis hijos infantes. (Cervantes, *Don Quijote*, I, 7; nueva ed. crít. de F. Rodríguez Marín, I, 250).
15. En casa me lo tengo [el vino]; mi oíslo me aguarda; en acabando de comer daré la vuelta... (Sancho speaking; *loc. cit.* II, 3, nueva ed. crít. IV, 103).
16. Por mí lo digo, pues mientras estoy cavando no me acuerdo de mi oíslo, digo, de mi Teresa Panza, a quien quiero más que a las pestañas de mis ojos (*loc. cit.*, II, 70; nueva ed. crít. VI, 405 f.).
17. (Músico segundo): Mas yo quiero yr por ellas [las gutarras]. (Músico primero): De camino, / diga a mi oyslo que, si viene alguno / al rapio rapis, que me aguarde vn poco... (Cervantes, *Entremeses* [*El Rufián viudo*], ed. Schevill-Bonilla, p. 32)
18. (Vejeje): ¿ Hay ocasión? (Faustina). Y muy grande. / Que mi oíslo se fué ahora / a la casa de los naipes. (Quevedo, *Entremés famoso de la endemoniada fingida*, ap. Cervantes, *Entremeses*, ed. Schevill-Bonilla, p. 186).

It seems likely that the earliest examples (1, 2) quoted here are by no means the earliest in existence, nor the earliest ever used. These two *oíslos* leave an impression of being already a detached unit, no longer to be translated simply by 'Do you hear it?' That they both refer to men is evidently due to our lack of fuller documentation, for the third example makes the initial epicene character of *oíslo* quite evident. Moreover, its author has already perceived that *¿ Oíslo?* is felt as singling out one person, man or wife. Yet this individualizing force, whether applied to a man (3, 12) or, more frequently, to a woman (5, 6, 10, 11, 13), is not yet sufficient to be effective in any of these cases without the addition of the proper name. The example of 1553 (no. 9), used by an obscure translator, prob-

ably less sensitively aware of the living currents of speech than a man like Rueda, is definitely behind the times, reflecting perhaps a linguistic usage earlier than Delicado's. In the case of Luis de Miranda, if he really was the soldier-priest who took a part in the first founding of Buenos Aires and described it in the first poem written in the region of the Plate,¹ and if his play was also written or revised there (which is not impossible) and was sent to Spain to be printed, one might argue that his linguistic consciousness, also, might be considered as retarded. Rueda must have been convinced that his listeners would know that Toruviso addressed two different persons, when he made him say (no. 7): *¡Oíslo! ¡Mochacha Menciguela!*; and it may be noted that he added the identifying name *not* to *Oíslo* but to *Mochacha*. If we may trust our texts, Timoneda, another man of the people (no. 10), although he manifestly had Rueda's *Paso séptimo* in mind, so keenly felt that *oíslo* was turning rapidly from a detached but common-gender substantive into an even more normal one, that he endowed it with the missing gender (*oíslo*, 10).² This, nevertheless, was premature: even Sebastián Mey still added the proper name to *oíslo* (12). With Cervantes, however, the word had become indisputably a substantive, as his consistent use of the possessive shows (13, 14, 15, 16), and it was addressed exclusively to the wife, with a pleasing anomaly in the ending, which Quevedo, for one (17), enjoyed.

The Academy is probably correct in not yet marking *oíslo* as obsolete, since the word is evidently still more or less alive not only in Venezuela (cf. above, note 2) but also in Salvador, where it applies to both men and women,³ a fact which suggests its pre-Cervantine importation.

The etymology of *oíslo* is the obvious one: *oís* + *lo*, accepted not only by the Academy and Zerolo, but also by Carolina Michaelis,⁴ who compares *oíslo* with verbal compounds like *dizque*, *penséque*, *dixemes*, *mamola*, etc. Yet Monlau⁵ probably expressed the opinion of many when he declared its origin unknown: 'pues no parece conjetura seria la que lo saca de la frecuencia con que marido y mujer tienen que preguntarse *¿lo has oído, lo oyes, oíslo?*' Unamuno apparently agreed, and tried his

¹ Cf. Ricardo Rojas, *Historia de la literatura Argentina*, 'Los Coloniales', I, 131 ff.; and especially Enrique de Gandía's recent study *Luis de Miranda, primer poeta del Río de la Plata*, Buenos Aires.

² Without knowing about this, the Venezuelan grammarian Rivodó, who considered *oíslo* as a current word, comparable to (*la*) *reo*, *soprano*, *testigo*, declared such a consumption would be desirable. (Cf. *Entreteneimientos gramaticales*, Paris, 1890-1902, III, 73, 90).

³ Salomón Salazar García, *Diccionario de provincialismos y barbarismos centro-americanos*, San Salvador, 1910², translates the 'incorrect' *amasa* by *oíslo* [mujer ú hombre] (p. 29), also *damo* (*Juan es su damo de ella*) as 'corrected' to *cuyo*, *galante*, *amante ú oíslo* (p. 96).

⁴ *Rom. Forsch.*, VII, 134.

⁵ *Dicc. etimológico*, 2nd ed.

hand at a new one,¹ and it would not be hard to find some word such as *osculum*, on which to base a plausible conjecture; but our own natural doubts before an all-too-natural derivation were finally dispelled by learning that in 'Hakitia', the Judeo-Spanish dialect of Morocco, the husband is called *habla*: 'Las mujeres casadas por una especie de respeto religioso, no llamaban a sus maridos por su nombre propio, pero solían llamarles: *Habla!*'²

Before this evident proof of a tendency to identify the husband lexicographically with imperative speech and the wife with silent obedience, a tendency perhaps not exclusively either Judaic or lexicographical, it is difficult to have further doubts. It is unfortunate that *oíslo* is, to all appearances, a moribund word, but it may be said that among the Spanish-speaking Jews of Northern Africa, in an atmosphere, although debased, as oriental as that of Southern Spain before the fall of Granada, *oíslo*, dropping into balance with *habla*, reflecting perfect wedded bliss, appears to have achieved a satisfying consummation.

JOSEPH E. GILLET.

BYRN MAWR, U.S.A.

SOME NOTES ON GERMAN LOAN WORDS IN ENGLISH

In *The German Influence on the English Vocabulary* (S.P.E. Tract No. XLII, Oxford 1934) the present writer attempted to assess the extent to which the English vocabulary has been enriched by borrowings from Modern German. It is obvious that such accounts must necessarily be incomplete and that additions and emendations will have to be made as fresh sources are investigated and new borrowings made. The following notes are offered as further contributions to the study of the High German element in the English language and as corrections to the already published material.³

apple strudel (1935). This word, a part translation of G. *Apfelstrudel* (apple pancake), is not recorded in *O.E.D.* and apparently not in general use in English, but see M. Lane, *Faith, Hope, and No Charity* (London, 1935), p. 108: 'Ada's friend from the Jewish caterers came round with a four-pound apple strudel.'

by blood and iron (1872), from G. *durch Blut und Eisen*, a phrase coined in a speech by Bismarck and first used in Engl. with reference to him.

¹ According to a remark by Fitzmaurice-Kelly, in the *Year-book of modern languages for 1920*, p. 140, but we have been unable to find Unamuno's proposed etymology. Perhaps Fitzmaurice-Kelly was referring to the etymology *oíslo* < *osilo* = *huesecito*, *mi costillita*, etc. of which Rodríguez Marín made fun in the edición crítica of the *Quijote*, iv, 104.

² Benoliel, 'Hakitia', *BAE*, xv (1928), 195.

³ Words marked with an asterisk were dealt with in S.P.E. Tract No. XLII and are repeated here, as earlier dates for their first appearance in English have come to the writer's notice.

coburg (1882), a thin fabric of worsted and cotton; from the G. place-name *Coburg*, but not used in this sense in G. The word was introduced after the marriage of Queen Victoria.

dumb (1823), in the meaning 'stupid' borrowed *via* American from the G. *dumm*.

geopolitics, geopolitical(ly), a quite recent borrowing from the G. *Geopolitik, geopolitisch* denoting the study of geography from a political point of view. For a recent example of its use in Engl. see Willoughby in *German Life and Letters*, II, 263 (July 1938): 'Geopolitically the South Tyrol under Austrian rule represented an enormous fortified bastion.'

Higher Criticism (1836), from the G. *höhere Kritik*; first recorded in English in a translation of Hengstenberg's *Christologie*.

ice-age (1873), from the G. *Eiszeit*, coined in 1837 by Karl Schimper of Mannheim.

**kapellmeister* (1831), conductor of an orchestra. The earliest date for the use of this G. word in Engl. given by the *O.E.D.* is 1838, but see J. Strang, *Germany in 1831*, I, 244: 'Only imagine a capell-meister tuning a six or nine-pounder into any particular key.'

kibitz, kibitzer (1933). This curious word, which denoted originally a spectator at a game, particularly at a bridge tournament, has been borrowed in the present century from American English and was ultimately taken from the Berlin Yiddish slang-word *kreibtschen* (visit). It is recorded in *Webster's Dictionary* (1934) and the following quotations will illustrate its penetration into English slang.

C. C. Nicolet, *Death of a Bridge Expert* (London, 1933), p. 110: 'I like kibitzers, I never object to having anybody not in the game peek at my hand,' and p. 255: 'I'll kibitz.' In another novel, Stuart Palmer's *Puzzle of the Pepper Tree* (no date) kibitzer is used (p. 39) of a spectator not at a game of bridge.

kirsch. In the abbreviated form this word is recorded in Engl. from 1869, but the fuller form *kirschwasser* is found as early as 1819 in Scott's *Montrose*.

**kursaal* (1833). In S.P.E. Tract No. XLII and in *O.E.D.* the date given for the earliest record of this borrowing is 1849, but see A. B. Faulkner, *Visit to Germany and the Low Countries* (1833), p. 33: 'Two of the best specimens of architecture in Wiesbaden are the Cursaal and the Colonnade.'

lifeguard (1648), borrowed during the Thirty Year's War from G. *Leibgarde*, or Du. *lyfgarde*.

manysided(ness) (1831). In S.P.E. Tract No. XLII it was shown that *one-sided* in the sense 'limited, partial' was a loan-translation of the G. *einseitig*, but the opposite *many-sided*, which is likewise a loan-translation of *vielseitig*, was inadvertently omitted. The quotations in *O.E.D.* show that *manysided(ness)* was used in English down to the middle of the 19th century always with explicit reference to Germany and in particular to the *Vielseitigkeit* of Goethe; see Lytton, *England and the English* (1833): 'Wordworth has not, it is true, the "manysidedness" of Goethe.' Also C. Löff, *Self-formation* (1837): 'It tends to give him the decantum illud of the Germans, *manysidedness*.' An earlier example than the first record in *O.E.D.* is to be found in Strang, *Germany in 1831*, II, 78: 'There is one peculiarity about the writings of Goethe which the Germans are ever talking about; that is what they call here the *Vielseitigkeit* or *manysidedness* of his mind.'

markworthy (1827), coined by Scott from the G. *merkwürdig*.

mouse and man (1845), in the sense 'with all hands on board' used by Carlyle in *Cromwell* from the G. phrase *mit Mann und Maus*.

nightside of nature (1848), in the sense 'the mysterious and irrational side of nature' coined from the phrase *die Nachtseite der Natur* which was common in the German Romantic period. The phrase first appears in English as the title of a popular book by Mrs Catherine Crowe.

noodle (1779), a strip or ball of dough served in soup, borrowed from the G. *Nudel*.

oof (1885). This slang word for 'money' is taken from the Yiddish phrase *oofstich* which is itself a modification of the G. *auf (dem) Tisch*. The earliest example in Engl. dated 1882 has the full phrase *ouftisch* which appears a few years later in the shortened form.

- **poltergeist*. The earliest example in S.P.E. Tract No. XLII and in *O.E.D.* was from the year 1871, but the word was apparently in use in Engl. in 1848 as it appears as a chapter heading in Mrs Catherine Crowe's *The Nightside of Nature*.
- putsch*, a coup d'état; not recorded in *O.E.D.* or in S.P.E. Tract No. XLII. The word was apparently borrowed round about 1920 and is now quite common in English newspapers. It appears to be spreading to English slang in the non-political significance of a 'push forward'. See Alice Campbell, *Flying Blind* (1938), p. 89: 'He grasped it firmly and flexing his muscles prepared a putsch'
- sugarbaker* (1617), confectioner, from the G. *Zuckerbaker*. *O.E.D.* records this word from the 17th century as now obsolete. It was, however, alive at least in the 19th century in works influenced by German. See Strang, *Germany in 1831*, p. 14.
- weaking* (1526), coined by Tyndale in his translation of the New Testament from Luther's *Weichling*.
- **weltschmerz* (1882). An earlier example than the one recorded in S.P.E. Tract No. XLII is to be found in J. Cotter Morison's *Macaulay* (1882), p. 181: 'Indigestion is responsible for much of the Weltschmerz and passionate unrest which has found voice in modern times.'
- word-building* (1862), coined from the G. *Wortbildung*. The earliest quotation in *O.E.D.* has. 'The well-known course of Teutonic word-building'

CHARLES T. CARR.

ST ANDREWS.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Miss Margaret Galway desires to acknowledge a grant from the Publications Fund of the University of London towards the publication of her article *Chaucer's Shipman in Real Life* in *M.L.R.* vol. XXXIV, October 1939. The acknowledgment was unfortunately omitted at the time of publication.

EDITOR.

REVIEWS

Work in Progress, 1939, in the Modern Humanities. Edited by JAMES M. OSBORN and ROBERT G. SAWYER. Privately printed for the Modern Humanities Research Association. Bulletin No. 17 A. 1939. 337 pp. No price.

The editors of this extraordinarily valuable and interesting publication, in this second year of their activities, have practically doubled their gift to scholarship. 337 pages in all, 5577 entries, and 61 pages of index, give some measure of the amplitude of the information conveyed, and of the pains taken to make it practical and accessible for consultation.

The labour and good-will that went to the making of this instrument of work are beyond praise. And the editors deserve all the assistance they can receive from institutions and individuals, in particular careful and prompt replies to their inquiries. It is evident, for instance, that one important group of references from Holland was subjected to delay and swelled unnecessarily the section of unclassifiable entries. And I notice that references appear to be wanting concerning work in progress upon Spanish-American or Portuguese literature in South American Universities. The development of Celtic studies, again, would appear from this list to be carried on entirely in the United States, except for one worker in Wales, one in Scotland, and two in France.

The total mass of work in progress, as here indicated, is indeed formidable. One might well wonder what it would be if a statement by a United States government report, quoted on p. v, were seriously erroneous. Three out of four scholars, it is there stated, cease their labours of research after they have completed their first student thesis. But it may be that all research is not necessarily directed towards publication, or completion in written form for permanent deposit, which I take to be the definition accepted in the enquiries of which this book is the record. For the true University teacher worthy of his name, every lecture given is a piece of work done, of research completed, or based upon such work.

It is evident, at all events, that the editors have in fact met with such good-will as ensured in the main the success of their admirably planned labours. And it is difficult to suggest in what way the arrangement of their material could be improved, for its convenience of use by scholars. I have tested the index, for instance, in many ways and have not found it wanting. Apart from its immediate usefulness, the book is a valuable record of scholarly activities and of their present aims and interests. One may look forward to *Work in Progress* being itself an object of study, and including an entry 'An Analytic Study of the Publication *Work in Progress*'. The especial trend of interests in English literature in present-day Germany, for example, as compared with those of a generation or two ago, are not without significance. The marked increase of Miltonic studies in recent years, again, is worth noting. The editors themselves

might consider the extension of their Preface to include some such considerations. They would be of great interest.

But perhaps we owe too much to them already to make further demands. Their publication is of the highest value, and we look forward to a continuance in future years of the generosity to which we are so much indebted.

C. J. Sisson.

LONDON.

The Articles. A Study of their Theory and Use in English. By PAUL CHRISTOPHERSEN. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard. London: Oxford University Press. 1939. 206 pp. 12s. 6d

In this stimulating and well-ordered dissertation, Dr Christophersen sets out to investigate afresh the conceptual notions underlying the three forms of the substantive in English, without article, with definite article and with indefinite article (Part I: General), and to examine in detail certain special uses in present-day English (Part II: Particular). He disclaims any intention to treat his subject exhaustively. His work is not a 'Handbook in the Use of the Articles' and it is not meant to replace, but only to supplement, 'what Wendt, Poutsma, and others have said on the subject'. A synchronistic study, after the manner of the Prague school, is shown to be possible but inadequate. How are we to explain 'at an end', 'once a day', 'the larger the better', 'and the like', without knowing something of the earlier forms of these phrases? Allowance, too, must be made for those subtle non-conceptual factors, such as sentence-rhythm, ellipsis, illogical stereotyped usage, or mere personal caprice. Having made due allowance for such factors, the author is convinced that it is both possible and desirable to formulate a more complete and satisfactory theory of the article in English than any hitherto attempted.

Christophersen inclines to the view that already in Old English the definite article as such, *se seo þæt*, had fully developed from the demonstrative pronoun in 'natural narrative prose style' and he cites Annal 897 in the *Parker Chronicle* at length in support of this conclusion. He endorses Osthoff's assumption that the so-called weak declension of adjectives originated in an Indo-European substantival *n*-suffix denoting a personal nickname or distinguishing name (Latin *rufus*, *Rufo*; *catus*, *Cato*) and he endeavours to trace, perhaps not quite convincingly, how this particular nominal form became more and more closely linked with the incipient definite article in the Germanic languages. With Curme he agrees in regarding sporadic strong forms in this position ('æt þam geongum', *Beowulf* 2860; 'æfter þam gehorsedum here', *Laud Chronicle* 877) not as forms due to scribal inadvertence but as survivals of older usage. Among present trends in the use of the articles, he discerns an extension of the zero-form (without article) due to several causes: to the tendency for both personified and collective 'continue-words' (Jespersen's 'mass-words') to become universalizations; to prosiopesis; to a conscious striving after succinctness; and to the increase of what

Straumann has termed the *block language* of press headlines, film captions, book titles, advertisements and telegrams.

It may be noted that the plural of 'weather' is certainly used more often than in the one phrase 'in all weathers' (p. 35 note). In stating the precise frequency with which weak adjective and zero-substantive appear in *Beowulf*, reference should have been made to Klaeber's edition of the poem (Introduction, § 25 3) where the facts are fully and accurately recorded. It is futile to quote the erroneous and conflicting statistics of others (p. 88). The description of the sword Hrunting, 'þæt wæs an foran ealdgestreona' (*Beowulf* 1458) may rightly be adduced as an early instance of the pregnant sense of *an* in Old English, but the rendering 'that was before a singular old treasure' is not helpful (p. 99). *Foran* is here not an adverb of time but rather an emphatic adverb modifying *an* and therefore significant in this connection: 'it was one in the first rank of ancient treasures', 'it was an excellent old treasure'. It is unlikely that 'a actually means *every*' in the phrase *to a man* (p. 122) as in 'We were all, at heart, Wordsworthians to a man' (J. B. Priestley), i.e. to the last man (without exception). Nor is this phrase new (p. 123). It is at least as old as Abbot Ælfric. See *N.E.D.* s.v. *to*, A. 13a. The names of diseases and ailments were, it is true, usually articleless in Old English, but the author's perusal of Cockayne's *Leechdoms* was casual if he noted 'only two instances of the article' in such cases (p. 147). Curiously enough, the article is frequently, though not consistently, used with the words for fever and gout (*fefer*, *dropa*). It is disconcerting to find that *Boece* refers to King Alfred's and not to Chaucer's version of *De Consolatione Philosophiae* (p. 177). Phrases of the pattern 'that fool of a man' are not inexplicable (p. 191). 'That fool of a man' = 'that foolish man', 'that man who deserves to be called fool'. 'That beast of a place' = 'that beastly place', etc. This usage is at least as old as the fifteenth century. See *N.E.D.* s.v. *of*, 24b.

These are, however, the very slightest of blemishes in a study which persistently maintains that high standard of scholarship usually associated with the Department of English in a Scandinavian University. Dr Christophersen has clarified several issues in his own special subject and has thrown new light on certain problems affecting Indo-European philology as a whole.

SIMEON POTTER.

SOUTHAMPTON.

The Place-Names of Hertfordshire. By J. E. B. GOVER, ALLEN MAWER and F. M. STENTON. (*English Place-Name Society*, Vol. xv.) Cambridge: University Press. 1938. xliii + 342 pp. 18s.

Hertfordshire is obviously an artificially created county, geographically and historically. Geographically it is split up by the great Thames-Ouse water-parting, and in striking contrast to the open downland of the north we have the broken country, often thickly wooded, of the remainder of the county. That this condition existed at an earlier date is probable

from the fact that *leah* is the most common of the place-name elements, followed by *feld*, (*ge*)*hæg*, and *wudu*.

Historically the same lack of unity prevailed. The east of the county seems to have been part of the kingdom of Essex, while the north was Middle Anglian, and at an early date became part of Mercia. This division is reflected in the ecclesiastical division of the county between the dioceses of Lincoln and London, while the dialect as revealed by the place-names shows clear signs of its two-fold source. The first mention of the county is in the eleventh century, but it seems likely that it first came into being during the reign of Edward the Elder.

English settlement here was late, probably in the second half of the sixth century. Braughing and Tewin are old names, but only thirty-five names survive in O.E. sources, and these are mostly from later copies of tenth-century documents. Exceptions are Aldenham (785), Elstree (785), Pinesfield (796), St Albans (Tacitus, Bede, etc.), Hanstead's (793), Cashio (793), Hatfield (c. 750), Hertford (c. 750). There is some evidence to suggest that a British population may have lived on here, in the name for the river Beane (*Bene ficcan*); but there are few British place-names retained, though we have Walsworth and Walden as traces of the Britons. Heathen names include Wain Wood, Grims Ditch, Barley Thundridge and possibly Tewin, while Puckeridge is also of interest.

The Danish invasions seem to have left little impression on Hertfordshire; indeed, there is little if any evidence of them in the county save Dacorum Hundred. To the original group of names in pre-Conquest documents we can add twenty-nine which appear first before 1086, and ninety-four first occurring in Domesday. The French element is scanty; there are a certain number of place-names containing the name of a feudal holder, and apart from those we find only Beaumont and Prae of French origin.

Names of particular interest include: Hitchin, Hemel Hempstead, Sperberry, St Albans (tribal names); Baldock, Troy Mill (exotic names); Royston, Ippollits (church names); Flamstead, Breakspeare (of historic interest). There are also a number of interesting names denoting the presence of barrows.

A number of new elements have been added (Introd. p. xx) and a few personal names with a double star—Brica, Dicen, Flaha, Pumi, Steorta; but few problems have been found, save Beckfield and Elbrook. There are some interesting and a few amusing field-names; and one notes the presence there of an unsolved element *nattok*.

The Squire MSS. in the John Rylands Library (Escheats, Hen. III-Ric. III) do not seem to have been used.

ANGUS MACDONALD.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

Old English Bynames. BY GOSTA TENGVIK. (*Nomina Germanica*, 4.) Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell. 1938. xxii + 407 pp.

This interesting and valuable work is, in some respects, complementary to Olof von Feilitzen's *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book*, and, like it, is by a student of the late Professor Zachrisson.

The plan of the book is comparatively simple. It is 'a systematic inquiry into the O.E. bynames found in O.E. sources from c. 700 to c. 1100 (including Domesday Book)', and is the first serious study of its kind. After summarizing previous works on modern English surnames, the author proceeds to examine the origin of the byname, which arises with the need for distinguishing between two people bearing the same name. He then goes on to discuss certain phenomena relating to bynames, such as their increase in the tenth and eleventh centuries, probably owing to Scandinavian influence, and the really enormous increase after the Norman Conquest, before beginning to classify these names.

His material is arranged under four heads: 1. Local bynames. 2. Christian names used as bynames. 3. Those derived from office and occupation. 4. Nicknames; and these the author examines in detail, giving the old spellings, etymological explanation, and the corresponding modern surnames.

Comment on a book of this nature, within obvious limits of space, is particularly difficult. Its value is manifest, and need not be stressed. The method, too, is probably the best that could have been adopted, though it may be that the author defeats his own good intentions when he attempts to give every possible interpretation of the names; from the point of view of clearness it might have been better to prune this part of the work severely.

The points which follow are all on details. Firstly, there are a few errors in the list of sources. Then the list of modern surnames is not complete; here are a few additions—*Edrich* (p. 167), *Malcolm(son)* (p. 190), *Tibbet(t)s* (p. 200), *Waldrum* (p. 203), *Forster* (p. 251), *Horder* (p. 254), *Soutar* (p. 272), *Tailyour* (p. 272), *Auld* (p. 312). *Prison* is recorded by *N.E.D.* before 1195 (pp. 25, 379), and while it is true that the first record there for *boatswain* is c. 1450 (p. 24), yet a late O.E. form is given, and a reference to Earle's *Land Charters* (cf. p. 238). The toponymical names have some forms which differ from those given in Ekwall's *D.E.P.N.* (e.g. *Luddington*, p. 34), while *Horwell(bury)*, given as in Hertfordshire (p. 45), is not in the index to the *E.P.N.S.* volume for that county. There is a good list of bynames from French place-names, and it is of some interest to note that *Ouu* (p. 105) is normally found as *Eu* or *Ew* in Scotland (*Philpewiston* 1577, now Philpington). Is *Malville* (p. 115) the source of the modern names *Melville*, *Melvin*? With *on Hrofeceaster* (p. 122) cf. *Swiðulf biscop on Hrofesceastre* under the year 897 in the Parker Chronicle. In *a Paules Stret* (p. 136) *a* seems more likely to be a reduced form of *on* than of *æt*. For *Hunlafing* cf. *Beowulf* l. 1143. To the list of -son names (pp. 146 ff.) one might add *Hubert masun* (Pennington Inscription of c. 1100). The quotations for *baxter* (p. 236) from *E.D.D.* have not been carefully studied, or it would have

been realized that they date to at least a century ago, the word is not found in Mod. Scots as a common noun. On the other hand, *cordiner* (p. 249), though obsolescent, is still used in Scots. Under *Fossator* (p. 251) it might be noted that *fossa*=grave occurs in the inscription on the grave of the Venerable Bede. With *Hostarius* (p. 255) cf. the Sc. surname *Durward*. The quotation from *Havelok* on p. 256 is rather badly mangled. With *Fresle* (p. 313) cf. *Frizell*, *Fraser*, *Frazer*.

ANGUS MACDONALD.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

Die Körperpflege der Angelsachsen. Eine kulturgeschichtlich-etymologische Untersuchung. Von WILLI GRAMM. (*Anglistische Forschungen*, 86) Heidelberg·C. Winter. 1938. 137 pp. RM. 7.

Part of the material discussed here has already figured in standard works—for instance, Gummere's *Germanic Origins* (*Founders of England*, Ch. III, Men and Women), and, of course, Hoops's invaluable *Reallexikon*. But it is none the worse for being gathered together in compact form, with references marked, and with all the vocabulary analysed. Herr Gramm's work is divided into two parts; the second, the larger, is purely etymological, and is based on Holthausen's *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* and Walde-Pokorny. The first is 'kultur-geschichtlich', and merits more attention.

The physical ideals of the Anglo-Saxons were height and strength. In their women they demanded fair beauty and a 'crowning glory' of hair, while they themselves must have paid scrupulous attention to their own hair, moustaches and beards. To satisfy the preference of the Anglo-Saxon gentleman for blondes, one finds the Anglo-Saxon lady resorting to bleaching to acquire the requisite tint; and, from the fairly extensive vocabulary, not a little leisure must have been occupied with curling, trimming, and cutting the hair.

The sections which follow deal with care of the face, beard, teeth, hands and feet (most of the material coming from glosses and from the *Leechdoms*); the last sections are on the bath and on physical exercises. Running, jumping, putting the weight, wrestling ('nicht im Freistil') and swimming most of all, were practised; and one now awaits a practical treatise explaining the precise 'holds' used by Beowulf and his demon opponents.

There are a few misprints and mis-spellings in the book, and occasional irregularity in the use of quantities. Is *nebbsealf* really 'rouge' (p. 12) and not 'face-powder'? And is not *ēarscripel* 'the little finger' rather than 'ear-spoon'? Herr Gramm has omitted to mention *tōþsealf*, and in his passage dealing with the care of the body it might have been worth his while to point out that the Anglo-Saxons knew of the emetic.

ANGUS MACDONALD.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

The Battle of Brunanburh. Edited by ALISTAIR CAMPBELL. London: Heinemann. 1938. xvi+168 pp. 10s. 6d.

Though stating that his edition of the poem aims 'in the first place at its linguistic interpretation', Mr Campbell has brought together the material necessary for the study of the poem from all points of view. He supplies diplomatic and critical texts, an examination of the manuscript relationships, linguistic, metrical, literary and historical studies, full interpretative notes, a glossary, and an appendix of all the more important references to the battle. It is a very thorough piece of work and will doubtless become the authoritative edition of the poem. It is therefore important to consider whether all Mr Campbell's conclusions can be accepted without modification.

The description of the early history of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is based, as is inevitable, on Plummer, but he did not commit himself, as does Mr Campbell, to placing a copy at Abingdon as early as 891.¹ As Professor Chambers points out (*England before the Norman Conquest*, p. xvi), Abingdon was in Alfred's day an insignificant house.² No Abingdon entry is claimed for this recension of the Chronicle before 971, and the omission of any reference to Abbot Æthelwold's appointment to the see of Winchester in 963 is strange if this chronicle was already at Abingdon. Similarly, Mr Campbell makes no reference to Professor Stenton's article ('The South-Western Element in the Old English Chronicle' in *Essays in Medieval History presented to T. F. Tout*) which gives strong reasons for doubting the early connexion of the Chronicle with Winchester.

These matters do not, however, affect Mr Campbell's main argument, which is as follows: two continuations of the Chronicle, covering the entries from 891 to 975, were circulated to the monasteries that had received copies of the Chronicle. The first continuation (Con¹) ended in 924, the second (Con²) covers 925-75, and Mr Campbell reconstructs it from those annals common to a sufficient number of manuscripts for their presence in a common ancestor to be assumed. Moreover, as MS. A begins a new hand in 958 and from this point on MSS. D and E together show greater independence of the remaining manuscripts, he assumes that Con² was sent out in two instalments, 925-55 and 958-75 respectively. The poem is in the first part of Con², and Mr Campbell states that behind the four manuscripts that contain it lie 'three distinct copies' of Con², from which A, B-C, and D are eventually derived. These results do not seem to me to rise inevitably from the material. I doubt whether the various sections of the Chronicle were circulated in so uniform a manner as Mr Campbell seems to suggest both here and in Section C of his introduction. An official sending out of Con¹, which includes a detailed account of Edward the Elder's wars, is probable, but it is much less certain that deliberate circulation of what Plummer calls 'ballads, obits and scraps' between 925 and 975 should have occurred. The means by which these reached the extant manuscripts may have been more varied

¹ *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, II, lxxiv, note 3.

² See F. M. Stenton, *The Early History of the Abbey of Abingdon*, Reading, 1913.

and complicated, and we should, I think, allow for the possibility of a certain amount of progressive copying. But Mr Campbell may have given a more definite impression than he intended, for on p. 8 he seems prepared to admit a closer connexion between the versions that lie behind B-C and D than between either of these and A. However this may be, the second part of Con¹ should not have been discussed without reference to Professor Jost's article ('Wulfstan und die angelsächsische Chronik', *Anglia*, XLVII), which suggests that poems in 959 DE, 975 D are written in the Wulfstan style and that the similarity noted by Earle² and Keller³ between the 959 poem and the end of Ælfric's *Book of Judges* is due to the use of the latter by the Chronicle. This would give 997 as the earliest possible date at which the version of Con¹ in D and E received one of its most characteristic features, and from a learned and ecclesiastical, not a popular source. Incidentally, Jost shows that it is far more probable that the 975 poem in D is from E's prose than vice versa, as assumed by Mr Campbell.

The linguistic study is detailed and the complicated material clearly arranged. I am not, however, quite clear why we must assume that dialect features shown to be in Con¹ but contrary to the usage of the compiler of this portion are forms 'introduced by the poets to adorn their work' rather than traces of the poet's own dialect.

The chapter on the historical background is one of the most useful sections of the book, for Mr Campbell has examined afresh the many and conflicting authorities and his statement of the probable course of events is clear and well-documented, controversial matters being discussed with fairness and commonsense. The chief among these, the problem of the site of the battle, he wisely leaves unsolved, for the evidence is insufficient for a precise localization. New is his explanation of the *Vínheithr* of the *Egilssaga* as due to confusion with Thorolf's earlier battle by the river *Vína* (i.e. the Dvina). It would be a strange coincidence if Thorolf took part in two great battles by rivers of the same name. While this is sound reasoning, I should like to suggest that the confusion of the two battles would be even more likely if the Scandinavians had had a name for Brunanburh corresponding to Symeon of Durham's *Weon-*, *Wendune*, an alternative name to which Mr Campbell attaches little significance. Though the correspondence may not be close, there is enough similarity to facilitate a confusion between the two. A minor point in this section of the book is the assumption that Symeon's *Guthredi* for *Guthfridi* is an error (pp. 49, 152). It is a normal anglicizing of Old Norse *Guðrøðr*, a later form of Old Norse *Guðfrøðr*, Old Danish *Guthfrith*.⁴

Mr Campbell has given us an accurate diplomatic text and a good critical one. His notes contain much that is of value, not only for the study of this poem but for Old English vocabulary in general, for he is

¹ See F. M. Stenton, *The Early History of the Abbey of Abingdon*, Reading, 1913.

² Plummer, *op. cit.*, II, 152.

³ *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxxiv, 37 f.

⁴ See O. von Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book*, p. 279.

never content to accept the dictionary rendering without further investigation. To pick out only a few, the notes on *ealdorlang* (l. 3), *geaþele* (l. 7), *mylenscearp* (l. 24), *Difelin* (l. 55), *Iraland*, *æwiscmod* (l. 56), *arhwæt* (l. 73) add to our knowledge of Old English usage or etymology. The cruces of the poem are exhaustively discussed, especially *dænnede* (l. 12), which Mr Campbell emends to *dunnade*, 'grew dark'. With regard to the discussion of *ðieorig* (l. 54), it may be true that this has been too readily rendered 'bloodstained' in the past, but surely *heorodreorig* is more probably a derivative of *heorodreor*, '(sword) blood', than 'rendered dreary by the sword' in *Beowulf* (ll. 934 f.).

þonne blode fah
husa selest heorodreong stod,

which should be compared with ll. 486 f.:

eal bencpelu blode bestymed,
heall heorudreore.

Finally, in addition to the articles mentioned above, the following works should have been included in the bibliography: A. Mawer, 'The Redemption of the Five Boroughs', *E.H.R.* xxxviii; *An Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, edited by E. Classen and F. E. Harmer (Manchester, 1926), which gives a better text of MS. D; and later editions of the *Battle of Maldon* than Sedgfield's, especially Miss M. Ashdown's excellent edition in *English and Norse Documents relating to the Reign of Ethelred the Unready* (Cambridge, 1930).

DOROTHY WHITELOCK.

OXFORD.

Lateinische Dichtung in England vom Ausgang der Frühhumanismus bis zum Regierungsantritt Elisabeths. Untersuchung zur nationalen und religiösen Grundlegung des englischen Humanismus. By WOLFGANG MANN. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1939. iv + 207 pp. RM. 9.

An account of the Latin poetry of the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries would have a real justification, not as a mere appendix to the history of the religious and secular verse of the full Middle Ages, but as a historical study of considerable importance.

It is true that the secular Latin lyric died out almost completely at the end of the thirteenth century, and that although, as the collections in *Analecta Hymnica* show, there was still a large output of religious rhymed verse, the primacy had definitely passed to the vernacular poetry. But Latin poetry of a learned kind was still a necessity and was, therefore, still produced.

The *Poetria Nova* of Geoffrey of Vinsauf represented the ideal set before the young versifier in England and in France. Chaucer was steeped in this 'rhetorical' tradition, which can be studied in the vernacular verse of both countries even beyond the end of the fifteenth century. The Latin poems of Gower owe nothing to any breath of humanism from

Italy; they look back to the medieval tradition, to Alexander Neckham, Peter Riga and Godfrey of Viterbo.

The Latin Renaissance came from Italy. There the feeling for classical form had never been completely obscured, and it could be renewed in the West only by the establishment of a living contact with the sources of inspiration which were nowhere else to be found. This contact, so far as England was concerned, was obtained in the first place by the visit of English scholars to Italy—men like Wm. Grey, John Free, Robert Flemming, John Gunthorpe and John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester. Then, with Linacre, Grocyn and Latimer, the era of effective teaching in England began, and Greek was taught at both Universities. Latin verse was never again composed on any model but that of the classical authors, and purity of prose style was aimed at with the utmost zeal. The Italians still remained the masters. Thus Henry VII employed Giovanni Ghil as his agent and 'orator' at Rome, and Peter Carmighano as his Latin secretary.

Pure Latin was a political necessity of the time. The Renaissance monarch must have at his service secretaries and agents whose style was above contempt, and he felt too that there was something in the promise of the poets and orators that it was theirs to confer immortality by the imperishable written word.

Hence a study like this of Dr Mann's is of real importance. He begins with Robert Flemming, Dean of Lincoln, Edward IV's representative at the Papal Court, whose *Lucubrationes Tiburtinae* were dedicated to the praise of Sixtus IV. Then he passes to the group of Henry VII's Court poets—Bernard André (Andrew), Johannes Opicius (whom he regards as an Englishman), Silvestro Ghil, Peter Carmighano.

Dr Mann gives a good account of the range of Opicius's verse, which is mainly political, in praise of Henry VII, and then deals with John Constable (a Pauline), the *Antibossicon* and Skelton. He is perhaps inclined to see 'bourgeois puritanism' where we do not so easily detect it, and so it is a little difficult for him to understand how Constable can have written a personal poem on the sufferings of Christ, a theme which was, of course, to keep its reality for more than a century to come.

The Epigrams of William Lily and Thomas More move Dr Mann to enthusiasm. One might be tempted at first to think that he does not see them sufficiently as learned exercises, and is inclined, therefore, to exaggerate their intrinsic merits. But it must be confessed that he makes out a complete case for More as a humanistic poet who uses Latin as a living means of expression, without pedantry or affectation. He shows how More's verses express his many-sided character, and how 'even in the most trivial utterance the whole personality is manifested'. Similarly, he deals with the poems of John Leland, the first great English antiquary, whose verse centres on the king (Henry VIII) and his policy, the growth of English power under her wise prince, and the praise of his illustrious contemporaries, especially those devoted to the learning which Leland had so much at heart. Leland's remarkable appreciation of Chaucer, his sense of the way in which, historically, the English had come to obtain

the new learning from Italy, his clear apprehension of Wyatt's achievement for English poetry are well illustrated by Dr Mann.

Next he deals with the 'epic attempts' of Sir Thomas Chaloner and John Shepreve, after this, with the poems of John Parkhurst (d. 1573, Bishop of Norwich) and Walter Haddon (d. 1572). These were all people of some importance, and (if we except Shepreve) supporters of the new religious order.

Finally, there is a study of the group of poems by Cambridge and Oxford scholars in memory of Bucer and of the two young Dukes of Suffolk, Henry and Charles Brandon, who died in 1551 on the same day, one an hour before the other.

It is clear that the quality and range of the verse deteriorates as the sixteenth century proceeds. The learned poem tends to become a purely academic product. It would be interesting to continue the history of Latin poetry throughout the reign of Elizabeth and the following century, but Dr Mann has given us a study for which many readers will be grateful. It is a contribution which carries on worthily the work begun by Dr W. F. Schirmer in his excellent book *Der englische Früh-humanismus*, published at Leipzig in 1931.

The only criticism which it is necessary to make is that the numerous quotations, for which the reader will be thankful, are often lacking in proper punctuation.

F. J. E. RABY.

HARPENDEN.

John Skelton, Laureate. By WILLIAM NELSON. New York: Columbia University Press; London. H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1939. ix + 266 pp. 15s.

Although Alexander Dyce's great edition of the poems came out as long ago as 1843, it was not until the present century that the rehabilitation of John Skelton was really taken in hand. Renowned during his lifetime as a great scholar and satirist, the Laureate Poet and Royal Tutor sank rapidly after his death to the level of a low buffoon. No one opposed Pope's contemptuous 'beastly Skelton' and his explanatory remarks about Billingsgate. But during the last forty years the labours of scholars and the approval of poets have made it abundantly clear, once and for all, that Skelton is a poet to be reckoned with. So much is certain, though uncertainty still remains. Both his life and works are still full of obscurities.

Mr Nelson's book has gone a long way towards bringing light into these dark places. It is full of new facts and fruitful suggestions, and is altogether the most solid contribution to Skelton scholarship which has appeared for some time. Mr Nelson is not concerned with a general review of Skelton's life, though there is a great deal of valuable biographical matter. His object has been to present studies of various aspects of Skelton's achievement, notably his humanism, the origin of Skeltonic rhyme, and an interpretation of *Speke, Parrot*. He gives an

excellent account, as far as this is possible, of the famous quarrel with Wolsey, and of Skelton's last years, though positive proof that he did not die in sanctuary is still lacking. All this, and more, Mr Nelson places against a background of contemporary events and personalities, and he has always something good to say.

At the same time the book suffers from its preoccupation with Skelton's scholarly activities and his concern for morality: his vivid and engaging personality tends to become submerged. To see, for instance, 'an underlying moral purpose' in *Elynour Rummynge* is to see too much. 'Skelton's crime', says Mr Nelson, 'is not that he portrayed Elnor, but that he did it too vividly.' But it is criminality of this sort which distinguishes Skelton's work from the dullness and aridity of so many of his contemporaries and constitutes his greatest charm for present-day readers. After all, Skelton was a man who liked to enjoy himself once in a while, though no doubt his scholarly conscience gave him an occasional twinge during the process.

L. J. LLOYD.

EXETER.

Poems and Dramas of Fulke Greville, first Lord Brooke. Edited by GEOFFREY BULLOUGH. Two volumes. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd. 1939. viii+323 pp., 284 pp. 30s.

This edition supplies a long-standing need. The poetry of Fulke Greville, notwithstanding his associations with Sidney and with the circle of Sidney's sister, shows an independence of outlook and originality of style approached by few, if any, of the later Elizabethans, and the study of his work as a whole, reflecting a more or less consistent criticism of life, goes far to clarify incidental obscurities and difficulties. Grosart's edition of 1868 is unreliable and now inaccessible. The manuscripts at Warwick Castle, which were roughly collated by Grosart and examined by Bullen, were subsequently mislaid. On the announcement of their rediscovery, in 1932, Professor Bullough abandoned his original project of a biographical study on Greville, proceeding instead to a systematic collation of available texts including the Warwick manuscripts. From this collation, together with extensive research on Greville's life and writings, the present edition has resulted. Re-investigation of the manuscripts has proved that, contrary to Grosart's statement, although many of the revisions are in Greville's hand, none of the manuscripts were originally transcribed by him. Comparison of the original transcriptions with the revisions would suggest that only *Caelica* was transcribed before 1610, a conclusion supported by the internal evidence of Greville's other works, most if not all of which were written or revised subsequent to this date. The handwriting of four different scribes can be detected in the original transcriptions, and the consequent inconsistencies in spelling and punctuation render the manuscripts unsuitable to serve as the basis of a modern edition. The text of the present edition, therefore, is based on that of the 1633 Folio, systematically collated with the manuscripts

and other available texts, variant readings being recorded in the commentaries. Such collation is clearly essential to an authoritative edition of Greville in view of his frequent and careful revisions of his work; thus, the line 'Starre-gazers only multiply desires' (*Caelica*, xvii, 14) was revised four times before reaching its present form. Greville's bad writing, peculiar spelling and neglect of punctuation add to the difficulties of deciphering these revisions, some indication of which is given by the photographic reproductions of pages from the manuscripts, and his editor is to be congratulated upon successful grappling with a formidable task.

Greville's achievement in lyrical poetry has been undeservedly overshadowed by that of Sidney. *Caelica* is a miscellaneous collection consisting of sonnets, in the strict sense—amounting to forty-one in a total of a hundred and nine pieces—pastorals, religious, political and love poems set to a variety of metrical forms. In default of evidence to the contrary Professor Bullough accepts the order of the poems in the early editions as representing approximately that of their composition; nor does he attempt to establish the identity of Cynthia, Myra and Caelica, a type of speculation peculiarly futile in the case of *Caelica*, the contents of which suggest detached interest in the lover's moods and reactions rather than a single overmastering passion. As a lyrist Greville manifestly belongs to the school of Sidney and Spenser, drawing motives and imagery from the common store of Petrarchism and neo-Platonism. But while similarities in detail between *Caelica* and *Astrophel and Stella* show many instances of direct borrowing, Greville was no mere imitator of Sidney, frequently utilizing familiar conventions with the express object of changing their significance by means of unexpected turns of thought, touches of travesty or flashes of malicious wit. A typical example is Sonnet xi in which, to quote Professor Bullough, from Sidney's 'pretty turn of conventional passion' Greville has fashioned a poem 'which might have been written by a modern Latin sceptical of English sex morality'. His stark realism and sardonic humour not infrequently recall the 'Dark Lady' sonnets rather than *Astrophel and Stella* or *Amoretti*; for the duality of his outlook, arising from confessed inability to reconcile the ideal with the actual, debarred him from the greater assurance afforded to Sidney and Spenser by their more naive neo-Platonism. But while in this sense his lyrical poetry represents a stage of transition between the Elizabethan and the metaphysical schools, in technique he belongs wholly to the earlier tradition. So long as he continued to write lyrical poetry Sidney remained his chief model, and in drawing the contrast between them Professor Bullough is inclined to underrate the relative value of Sidney's achievement. Sonnet xxiv does not necessarily show that 'Greville sees further into the method of art than his more rhapsodical friend' if due allowance be made for the difference in scope and form between the sonnet in question and the *Apology for Poetry*. The predominant influence throughout *Caelica* is that of Sidney and his school. When this influence had spent itself, Greville abandoned the lyric in favour of didactic poetry and rhetorical drama consisting largely of

matter that better fitted prose. That Professor Bullough is conscious of this anti-climax is evident from the concluding sentences to his introduction

We accept his dramas and treatises for what they are; but may well wish that he had been either more of a poet or less; if less, that he had followed the example of Bacon and written in prose. For in Greville was lost a great moral and political essayist.

All that can be done to make good this deficiency by way of commentary upon Greville as a moralist and political theorist is achieved in the present edition. The difficult problem of identifying sources to the dramas is discussed at length, the editor concluding that, before writing *Mustapha*, Greville may well have been acquainted with *La Soltane* of Gabriel Bounin and that *Alaham* is based probably upon the version of the story in the *Itinerary* of Ludovico di Varthema. Chronologically Professor Bullough places *Alaham* between the earlier versions of *Mustapha*—in the Trinity College, Cambridge, manuscript (C) and the Quarto of 1609 (Q)—and the later versions in the Warwick manuscripts (W) and the 1633 Folio (F). The commentary and appendices supply all variant readings necessary for comparison of the different versions, the order of which is deduced as C, Q, W, F. In Professor Bullough's opinion, supported by substantial evidence, the recasting of the play reflects Greville's growing preoccupation with political ideas as distinct from dramatic situation and plot rather than a *volte face* occasioned by the accession of James I. Be this as it may, a poet's sense of values would alone be sufficient to account for the transferring of the great 'Chorus Sacerdotum', originally concluding Act I and omitted in the Warwick manuscripts, to the close of the play.

Close editorial scholarship and critical penetration combine to render this work invaluable not only to the textual critic but to all readers interested in the subject. Its reception should be such as to render possible the publication of Greville's other writings under the same editorship.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

LONDON.

Shakespeare auf der deutschen Bühne vom Ende des Weltkrieges bis zur Gegenwart. Von WOLFGANG STROEDEL. Weimar. Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger. 1938. x+97+48 pp. Geb. RM. 8.30, br. RM. 6.80.

Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, Band 74. Herausgegeben von W. KELLER. Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger. 1938. vii+263 pp. RM. 16.

Herr Stroedel's review of Shakespearean production and performance during the post-war period is a most interesting piece of work. A brief historical retrospect is followed by some general remarks on Shakespeare and the modern stage: the problem of costume is here very sensibly discussed, and (a reply to the purists) it is insisted that changes of scene are no longer so distracting now that a whole series of settings can be

arranged on the revolving stage and played without dropping the curtain. Then comes the question (it was bound to come!), How does our time regard Shakespeare? in reply to which the author insists (without sufficient discrimination) that the close connexion between personal and political in all great drama is now much more clearly recognised. A very interesting section is then devoted to modern translations and revisions, in the course of which, however, no reference is made to the uncomplimentary but not unjust treatment of Gundolf's version by Karl Kraus (*Hexenszenen und anderes Grauen*, in *Die Sprache*, pp. 166 ff.). Two sections are devoted to the admirable work of Saladin Schmitt at Bochum, where, after years of preparation, the ten English Histories were produced during the first Shakespeare Week, in 1927, and where, ten years later, a second Shakespeare Week was devoted to the Roman tragedies. The fortunes of the other plays during the post-war period are then briefly reviewed. That *Coriolanus* should be among the plays most seldom performed will perhaps seem natural to an English reader, but he will be surprised to learn that there have been still fewer performances of *Antony and Cleopatra*—is it, perhaps, because the miraculous poetry of this play is more essential and more untranslatable than in almost any other? So, too, the author has to search for explanations for the comparative neglect of *Macbeth*, and suggests that it is because the pity tragedy should excite is extinguished by the endless succession of Macbeth's crimes; but is not the true explanation to be found in the poetical defects of Schiller's version, and in the fact that Schlegel, who, as Karl Kraus has suggested, might have succeeded, did not dare to attempt it? A table of productions and performances between 1919 and 1937 is given, from which emerges the astounding fact that there have been more than thirty thousand performances of Shakespeare's plays in Germany since the war. The text is followed by sixty-four excellent photographs of scenes and settings.

While Herr Stroedel's book reminds us that Shakespeare's plays are still being extensively performed in Germany, the indispensable *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* reminds us that they are still being intensively studied. In a totalitarian state this preoccupation with Shakespeare is sometimes felt to require justification, which, however surprising the conclusions it may lead to, is duly provided. Thus, after turning over a few pages, the reader will come to Gauleiter Joseph Wagner's opening speech at the Second German Shakespeare Week, *What is Shakespeare to us?* The Germans, he declared, find in Shakespeare what they most desire (How many predecessors they have had! How much history and autobiography is to be found in Shakespearean criticism!): the view of existence as a whole, the struggle for the totality of life in general.

The Leader's great Culture-speech at the last Imperial Party Conference at Nurnberg describes with penetrating clarity the effort of National Socialism to comprehend all fields of public life under the lofty unity of idea and will. Just as in each single work of Shakespeare there lives a whole, which with its own words demands: "Give me all your blood to drink!", even so the Leader, and with him the entire nation, addresses to every German the inexorable demand to contribute his utmost for his own people and therewith for a further ascent of humanity.

To which the spirit of Shakespeare might reply:

Du gleichst dem Geist den du begreifst,
Nicht mir.

Also tinged with politics, but far more rational and acceptable, is Dr Rainer Schlosse's speech on the same occasion, *The German Shakespeare*. Shakespeare, like all great artists, is firmly rooted in his own country: why, then, do we Germans so admire him? Why has it been the ambition of almost every great German poet to become the German Shakespeare? Because, he replies, we recognize within his universality that fundamentally Nordic element which we have learnt to regard as the most valuable possession of our own people. Because, having learnt that art and politics cannot be separated, we find that Shakespeare's plays are full of politics. (Let him re-read Bernard Shaw's remarks on the 'politics' of *Julius Caesar*!) Because (an excellent reason) the language and style of the Schlegel-Baudissin-Tieck translation is on the same level as that of Goethe, Schiller and Grillparzer.

Nevertheless, the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* can still improve our knowledge of Shakespeare as well as our knowledge of Germany. In a survey of *Recent Shakespearean Criticism* Professor Elmer Edgar Stoll finds ample opportunity to reiterate his conviction that Shakespeare was, first and foremost, a man of the theatre. He finds, as might be expected, little good in Professor Charlton—almost nothing, in fact, but a persistent attempt to discover in the plays something that is not really there. He objects to Miss Spurgeon's attempt to interpret the plays as personal records. He insists that the ingenuities of Professor Dover Wilson's *What Happens in Hamlet* all miss the fundamental point that Shakespeare was rewriting and rearranging, and he feels that even Sir Harley Granville-Barker has been tainted by modern psychology.—Dr E. L. Stahl's essay on *The Production of Shakespeare on the English Stage during the Nineteenth Century* is a most full and scholarly piece of work.—Eva Buck's *Cleopatra, An Interpretation of Character* is more ingenious than convincing: briefly, her point is that, during the course of the play, Antony and Cleopatra each absorb the qualities of the other—Cleopatra becoming more and more masculine, Antony more and more feminine.—The balanced and scholarly lecture on *Titus Andronicus*, delivered during the Bochum Shakespeare Week by the editor, Professor Wolfgang Keller, is perhaps the best and completest study of that play that has yet been produced. He rightly insists that it is just what might have been expected from the young beginner eager to outshine Marlowe and Kyd, and also that the evidence in favour of the assumption that the *Titus* and *Vespasia* mentioned by Henslowe in 1592 was Shakespeare's first version of the play is more convincing than Chambers and others have allowed. He deals learnedly and sensibly with the possible sources of the impossible history.—In a penetrating and comprehensive little essay Professor Max Deutschbein adduces strong reasons for retaining the reading 'solid', which Professor Dover Wilson would replace by 'sullied', in Hamlet's line

O, that this too too solid flesh would melt.

Order, compactness, solidity—disorder, dissolution, rottenness are, he insists, continually recurring antitheses in what might be called Shakespeare's cosmic thinking. Hamlet is simply wishing for his little world of man the fate which seems to have overtaken the great globe itself.—Professor Wolfgang Keller's *Bucherschau* (a general review of recent Shakespearean literature) contains many just and penetrating observations which may easily escape attention. Of Messrs Mur and O'Loughlin's *The Voyage to Illyria* he remarks that the danger of such attempts to prove things by 'cumulative evidence' is that they encourage the belief that two half-truths make a whole. Apropos of Stoll's *Shakespeare's Young Lovers*, he suggests that the tall blonde heroine and the short brunette, who appear together in so many comedies, may be due to the fact that there were two boys thus sharply distinguished from each other in Shakespeare's company. He agrees with Professor R. W. Chambers (*The Jacobean Shakespeare and Measure for Measure*) that the change of government was by no means generally regarded as a national misfortune, and that there is no necessary connexion between tragedy in a play or poem and tragedy in its author's life; nevertheless, he insists that the essential difference between Shakespeare's Elizabethan and Jacobean tragedies consists, not in the 'evil characters', which naturally appeared in the first works of Marlowe's pupil, but in the conception of the world itself as evil, 'rotten', 'out of joint'. In a notice which deals justly with A. S. Cairncross's *The Problem of Hamlet*, he suggests that the best explanation of the transpositions in the First Quarto is that, instead of a bound volume, the short-hand writer used loose leaves, which got disarranged.

Thus Shakespeare is still being seen 'steadily' in Germany, and, in spite of attempts to establish a kind of Nurnberg-Stratford axis, one is glad to think that he is still being seen 'whole'.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

SOUTHAMPTON.

The Works of John Milton. Columbia Edition, under the general editorship of F. A. PATTERSON. Vol. XIII (1937): *State Papers* xiv + 646 pp. Vol. XVIII: *Uncollected Writings*. xxi + 656 pp. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. £24 for set of 18 vols.

Volume XIII of the Columbia edition of Milton's works contains the *State Papers*, edited by T. O. Mabbott and J. Milton French. They are derived from three sources: (1) a series of letters in the Columbia Manuscript, once in Milton's library, which are said to be in the hand of the amanuensis who signed Milton's contract for *Paradise Lost*; (2) the Skinner Manuscript, prepared at Milton's direction by Daniel Skinner; (3) the printed collection of 1676, the text of which Edward Phillips used for his translation and which the Columbia editors also make their basic text. In addition the editors print whatever documents, thought to be composed by Milton, have been discovered in foreign archives. No doubt this section of Milton's writings is still incomplete, but the editors have spared no pains to make their collection as complete as possible.

Volume xviii, by the same editors, with translations by N. G. McCrea not only includes 'all the known works of Milton, considered authentic by the editors, that have not appeared in previous volumes', but deals in the notes with 'doubtful, apocryphal, and lost pieces'. Among the miscellaneous contents are two essays in the *Columbia Manuscript (Of Statues and Antiquities and A Brief Description of Genoa)*, which are doubtfully ascribed to Milton, and the 1640 texts of the Hobson poems discovered by W. R. Parker, but the most valuable new material is the selection of *Marginalia* from books owned and annotated by Milton. One is puzzled to think why the editors, under *Apothegmata* (p. 389), quote from Newton passages based on Edward Phillips and Jonathan Richardson.

The *Columbia Milton* is now complete, and one can congratulate Professor Patterson and his fellow editors on the successful accomplishment of an immense undertaking. A few volumes might have been better edited, but the general level of the work is of the highest order. As a complete and critical text of Milton's writings and of the documents necessary to the study of the author it not only supersedes all previous editions but stands in a class by itself; already it is accepted as the new base of Milton scholarship. Milton scholars will ever be indebted to all concerned in producing this monumental edition.

B. A. WRIGHT.

SOUTHAMPTON.

Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature. Edited by DOUGLAS BUSH, FRED OTTO NOLTE and CLYDE CANON WEBSTER. Vol. xx. 1938. Cambridge, Mass.. Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 250 pp. 10s. 6d.

Among the fourteen articles in this volume are two on Milton by Mr J. Milton French. In *The Powell-Milton Bond* (pp 61-73) Mr French tells, from documents discovered in the Record Office, the complete story of Milton's loan of £300 to Powell, as a strictly business transaction. The bond itself, which was found under 'Certificates and Recognizances' (C. 152), witnesses that on 11 June 1627 Powell bound himself to pay Milton £500. this gives no new information, but on the back are several endorsements that do. The first of these endorsements testifies that the bond was 'certified' in Chancery on 6 December 1646, showing that legal action in the matter had been taken at that time: the second testifies that the bond was cancelled on 29 November 1659, after satisfaction of the debt, and a sprawling 'John Milton' is appended which appears to be an example of his post-blindness signature. The bond is also entered in the Lord Chancellor's Recognizance Books (L.C. 4/200, p. 265), where it appears that Powell's son was present on 29 November 1659, and received the cancelled bond from Milton's hands. Mr French next turned his attention to the proceedings indicated in the first endorsement of 1646. He found that Milton, answering a Chancery Bill brought against him in 1654 by Elizabeth Ashworth (who was claiming to com-

pound for the Powell estate in respect of a mortgage held by her late husband), testified that the interest on his loan had been paid until 1644 and had then ceased, in 1646 Milton had accordingly obtained the 'Certificate' of his bond, by means of which he could obtain a writ authorizing the Sheriff to take an extent or inventory of the debtor's estate. The pertinent documents were found in 'Proceedings on Statutes Staple' (C. 288/6), both the writ of 16 July 1647 authorizing the Sheriff of Oxfordshire to take an extent of Powell's real estate in Wheatley, and the inquisition by a jury of twelve on 5 August 1647. On 20 November 1647 Milton entered into possession of the property. His returns from the property are given in the same group of documents for each half-year from Michaelmas 1648 to 1653; in 1651 there is a sudden increase of 50 %, caused by the fact that the parliamentary committee had refused to continue the payment out of the property of Mrs Powell's widow's thirds. 'By a decree of the Court of Chancery, dated in 1657, it was decided that in Michaelmas, 1656, Milton had received enough to satisfy his debt, with a surplus of £4. 17s. 4d. which he agreed to turn back to Richard Powell Jr. The transaction was complete, except for the formalities of cancellation.' Mr French, who gives in full all the relevant documents, together with facsimiles of both sides of the Powell-Milton bond, has succeeded in telling the complete story of a transaction which hitherto students have had to piece together as best they could from the evidence in Masson and in W. D. Hamilton's 'Original Papers'.

Mr French's second article (pp. 75-80) deals with Milton's annotated copy of Gildas, which he has discovered in a collection of early histories of Britain, *Rerum Britannicarum... Scriptores Vetustiores ac Praecipui*, edited by Hieronymus Commelinus and published at Heidelberg in 1587. The volume was given to Harvard College Library by Thomas Hollis about 1765, but appears not to have been examined until Mr French discovered it. The annotations, which are in Latin and which have since been printed in volume xviii of the Columbia Milton, are confined to the Gildas portion of the book; Mr French prints them in full, together with a translation and two pages of facsimile, the relevant excerpt from the text and the translation of the text from the 1638 English edition of Gildas. Some of the annotations reveal the influence of this English translation of 1638 and so do not contradict the general opinion that Milton's reading in British history began in the early 1640's. Many of the annotations agree closely with passages in the *History of Britain*; and of the authors referred to, all but Saxo appear in the *History* and all but Polydore are among Milton's favourite sources. Mr French observes that these marginalia illustrate not only Milton's habitual sifting of the printed statement but also his activity as a lexicographer.

B. A. WRIGHT.

Tom Brown Of Facetious Memory. By BENJAMIN BOYCE. (*Harvard Studies in English*, xxi.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1939 xi+216 pp. 10s. 6d.

The sub-title of this book, 'Grub Street in the Age of Dryden', provided sufficient justification for this extended study, but Mr Boyce need not have been so apologetic in introducing his hero. 'Tom Brown is, of course, small beer' is an unpromising start to such a knowledgeable and judicious monograph.

The trouble with those period studies which revolve round some more or less negligible or vulgar literary personality—such as Brown in the general estimate is deemed to have been—lies in the relation of the writer to his subject. How is the clown or hack to be condescended to by the modern writer of theses? Mr Boyce has solved the difficulty with tact and good manners. There is no condescending and equally there is no blurring of the discreditable side of the picture. Tolerance and good humour do for his subject all that can be done for him, and as the writer has in view from first to last the literary hints and suggestions that greater men took from him, Tom emerges in the last pages as a rather considerable occasion of wit in others, notably the brilliant prosemen of the next age.

Even the occasional student knew of course that the art of the Queen Anne wits had been fed by contributory streams, some of them pretty muddy streams, and that though they made merry over L'Estrange, Ned Ward, Tom Brown and others, these same wits were not above improving on their efforts to amuse that middle-class rabble which in Revolution days had become the new godhead of letters. But while many people have a passing acquaintance with Ned Ward's *London Spy*, very few could show offhand just how, here and there, Tom Brown influenced his betters. Mr Boyce makes us acquainted with his *Amusements Serious and Comical* (1700); his *Letters from the Living to the Dead* (1702); and his *Familiar and Courtly Letters* (1700), not to speak of numerous other ventures incident to a master hack in that noisome age. As with L'Estrange and the others, bread was the *causa causans* of this stupendous activity, bread and the thirst of the public to have everything French or at least foreign rushed into vulgar English at the earliest moment.

Here, for example, is Tom's free rendering of the sixteenth-century Florentine Gelli's *Circe* with its argument against man's perfection in the animal creation. How Swift availed himself of this inversion of rôles in his book on the Houyhnhnms in *Gulliver's Travels* and how Gay toyed with it in his *Fables* is well known, but few know that it was Brown's version which set them on this congenial track. Then there is Brown's *Walk Round London*, a continuation of his *Amusements* with its *Westminster Abbey* which Mr Boyce persuades us provided the suggestion for Addison's famous essay, though it in turn derives from a similar essay in Ward's *London Spy*. This indeed is where our author proves a valuable cicerone. Most of these things are pointed out in footnotes to editions

of the greater men, but Mr Boyce gathers the evidence together and shows, from instances like the Westminster essays, how the Addisonian periodical grew out of the crude inventive brains of the elder race of journalists. Material for an excellent thesis on the periodical essay lies about in abundance here.

But Mr Boyce is more than a thesis writer. He has in his range all the literary motley of that crowded vulgar day. True, his book will attract only the student of the period, but it will be welcomed by the latter as a faithful and lively guidebook.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

Studien zur Englischen Literaturkritik, 1910-30. By HANS WALTER HAUSERMANN. (*Kolner Anglistische Arbeiten.*) Bochum-Langendreer: H. Poppinghaus. 1938. vi+244 pp. RM. 8.

It is a pity that this highly objective account of English literary criticism will in all probability have a negligible English public. I do not know any survey of its kind in English. Written from the outside by one obviously familiar with the trends and by-paths of European criticism, no less than with the course taken by English criticism, it pursues its theme with what some will regard as Teutonic relentlessness, but in doing so exposes a wealth of matter provocative of thought. This indeed is the sort of study which helps us to understand the reproach of amateurishness in literature and the arts which is sometimes levelled at us. And one can enjoy imagining what the older critics who regard poetry as a school of character or a finishing school in sensibility will think of such a treatise. For, after all, Herr Hausermann is with the newer school of critics (though he understands the limitations of the school), whose prophet is Dr I. A. Richards and who want to see criticism approximating to scientific method, rather than with the older race of Saintsbury and Whibley, W. P. Ker and Bradley. For behind the criticism of the latter is the gentleman ideal which never ceases to puzzle the German.

In his long historical review of English criticism leading up to 1910, Herr Hausermann discovers in Addison, the disciple of Locke, the originator of modern psychological method in criticism. Others discover in him the beginnings of romantic criticism with its emphasis on the imagination. Some of us imagined that this emphasis had something to do with Coleridge's eminence as a critic. Our author is inclined rather to think, with Mr A. E. Powell and Dr Richards, that Coleridge's insistence on 'the fact of mind' places him in other, much more modern, company. 'Die Schlüssel-stellung, die der "fact of mind" in seiner Ästhetik einnimmt, ist von I. A. Richards hervorgehoben worden.' But he rights himself—'die Innenschau ist nur der Weg zur mystischen Vereinigung mit dem Weltgeist, mit Gott'. So that we cannot, mercifully, reduce Coleridge to a middle term between Addison and Dr Richards.

It is amusing to see Saintsbury and W. P. Ker with the nameless rout

of Bradleys and Quiller-Couchs whistled off our author's hands to make room for Dr Richards, Mr Herbert Read, and Mr Robert Graves; but that is no doubt excused by his thesis, that twentieth-century criticism demands not mere sensibility or character ideal but thought. 'Nie ist der Ruf: Mehr Intelligenz! lauter erhoben worden als in der englischen Kritik des 20. Jahrhunderts' We have no space to follow him into the age of intelligence, but can assure the reader that no eddy of modern critical thought is passed unnoted in these pages. The reader whose hostility to the new criticism is instinctive would do well to accept Herr Hausermann's well-meaning guidance.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

Humanism and Imagination. By G. R. ELLIOTT. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1938. ix+283 pp. \$2 50.

This book is made up of essays, many of which had previously appeared in periodicals. It is convenient to have them gathered into a single volume. The title is somewhat misleading in that references to the imagination are few and lacking in significance.

The first essay, 'Humanism and the Spirit of Poetry', is the most important. It raises a vital general question and treats it with skill. The reader may, however, not be entirely satisfied. Mr Elliott complains that Arnold and the American 'humanists' 'overrode the poetic view of life with the historico-moral view'. He ignores the fact that the mid-nineteenth century and the early twentieth century certainly demanded a revival of concern with 'moral ideas' in the large sense in which Arnold used the term. It seems strange that he should have proposed Spenser even more emphatically than Keats as the representative of the poetic view of life, which he defines as 'seeing each fact in its true poetic and therefore in its true ethical posture'. The 'therefore' is disturbing. One may contend that the poetic view of life is preferable to the moral, but the two are certainly not identical; and to insist that the truly poetical is *ipso facto* truly ethical is to work dangerous confusion. There is the same confusion in his analogous assertions: 'poetry is not great because it is moral; it is moral because it is great' and 'great poetry, such as Keats's poem, is in accord with virtue while, and because, it pursues its own way'. Mr Elliott accuses Arnold of preaching 'beauty and truth (sweetness and light) in a fashion that seemed to partition them off from morality'. This statement is hardly accurate. Arnold recognized a relationship between poetry and morals and insisted upon it; but he also recognized the separateness of the two fields. So too did More and Babbitt. Mr Elliott himself speaks of 'keeping distinct the poetic and moral standpoints' after he has sedulously endeavoured to confound them.

Mr Elliott's strong religious convictions render the critical humanism of Babbitt distinctly less acceptable to him than the religious humanism of More, and mislead him into exaggerations from time to time. Spenser,

Shakespeare, and Milton, he says, 'cannot be understood apart from catholic Christianity'. Surely this remark, true in part for the first and third, is decidedly questionable for the second. Later a pious passage from *Measure for Measure* is quoted as representing 'the attitude of Shakespeare in his total writings'. These three poets are united also, somewhat strangely, by 'another quality which they share—very obvious in Shakespeare but no less important in Spenser and Milton—namely Renaissance naturalness, or naturalism', which proceeds, according to Mr Ellhott, from their common 'catholic Christian humaneness'.

Other essays offer pleasantly intimate portraits of Babbitt and More, including some pages on the relation of Mr T. S. Eliot to Babbitt; analyses of the ideas and attitudes of the two humanists; and a very good appraisal of the work of Stuart Sherman. Most of the rest of the book is given to Emerson's 'Grace' and 'Self-Reliance', 'Civilization and Christianity', and 'The Nature of Symbols'.

BARRY CERF.

PORTLAND, OREGON.

Verschiebungsdynamik im Französischen Wortschatz, Ein Ansatz zweier Kategorien. By ERHARD PREISSIG. (*Schriften der Philosophischen Fakultät der Deutschen Universität in Prag*, Band 16.) Prague: Rudolf M. Rohrer. 1938. 302 pp.

This book is a distinctly original contribution to linguistic study. We can recall only one other work in which words constituting a single sense-group have been examined at such length and in such detail, viz. Gilliéron's *Généalogie des mots qui désignent l'abeille*. The parallel, however, goes no further. Herr Preissig's book is historical; it is concerned primarily not with dialects but with literary French, and it derives manifestly from the teachings of the Idealistic school. We may describe it as a study in historical semantics, of Idealistic inspiration.

The title is no less original than the treatment: our first duty as reviewer should be perhaps to explain it.

The term *Verschiebungsdynamik* is of Herr Preissig's coinage. We venture to interpret it thus: The psychological activity which determines semantic development. The two categories referred to are (a) Terms indicating direction and situation (*Richtung und Lage*), and (b) Terms connected with social rank and moral qualities (*Der Entwicklungsumfang der Bezeichnungen des Standesideals*). These two categories are classified respectively as *Aussere Verschiebungsdynamik* and *Innere Verschiebungsdynamik*.

By far the greater part of the book is devoted to the former of these categories. Here the author, basing his conclusions on the study of some three hundred texts, ranging from the early Middle Ages to the present day, shows the difficulties at first experienced by French authors in expressing the abstract notion of direction, the ways in which these difficulties were overcome by the different social and regional classes, the resultant creation of a body of synonymous terms, and the choice

made among these terms by authors of the succeeding centuries. Noteworthy is the common use made by medieval writers of expressions of purely egocentric (*ichbedingt*) connotation. The positive results of Herr Preissig's investigations are summarized in a table indicating for each of the authors studied the percentage of 'direction-terms' of learned origin, of 'popular-inland' origin, of Provençal origin, of north-west French origin; the interest of the table lies in showing how the 'popular-inland' and Provençal terms, at first predominant, are gradually ousted by the terms of the north-west. Incidentally, the bibliography forms an attractive repertory of the literature of travel in French.

In the shorter second part the author treats the semantic development of such terms as *généreux*, *courtois*, *gentil*, *franc*, *noble*, *baron*, *seigneur*, *vaillant*, *vassal*, *enfance*, *brave*, *libéral*, etc. This part forms the best reading, and cannot fail to interest linguists of every shade.

As regards the general theory of the book, we hesitate to express judgement. The reader will find at times, as in most writings of Idealistic flavour, phrases which will delight him by their precise expression of indisputable truths; at other times he will probably encounter a certain nebulosity, and wonder whether it exists merely in his own mind.

W. D. ELCOCK.

SHEFFIELD.

Etude sur la Syntaxe des pronoms personnels sujets en ancien français. By TORSTEN FRANZÉN. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells. 1939. vii + 165 pp.

This thesis bears witness to the ample documentation and conscientious analysis which one expects from a pupil of M. Melander. Based on a wide reading of texts of the Old French period proper, with occasional references to Middle and Modern French, it sets forth all the main principles governing the use of personal pronoun subjects in Old French. The abundant material appears to be, with few exceptions,¹ accurately interpreted and classified.

The first three chapters are chiefly concerned with refuting the statement, still found in recent works by eminent scholars, that in Old French the personal pronoun subject always had emphatic force. Another and more widely held view which M. Franzén endeavours to disprove is that the extension of the use of subject-pronouns in French is in relation with the phonetic evolution which obscured the personal endings of verb-forms; as he shows (Ch. VI), it is probable that in speech the pronouns were in general use before the silencing of final consonants had begun to level out verbal terminations. He also brings out a number of other facts of varying degrees of significance, several of which were not hitherto precisely known; they concern, notably, the relative frequency of

¹ It is hardly correct to include among "propositions intercalées dans le discours direct" *Oligés* 3335, "Si come il dut', ai je mantri" (p. 72). In *Raoul de Cambray* 8710, "Ruent il pierres. . .", *il* represents *i* (cf. the MS readings at 8523 etc.); there is therefore among the passages quoted on p. 149 no valid exception to the principle that the personal pronoun subject does not follow the verb unless the latter is preceded by a stressed term.

subject-pronouns in different types of clauses (Ch. II, IV), the use of quotation formulae such as *dist il*, *ce dist*, '*Monjoie*' *escrie*, etc (Ch. V), and the influence of certain subordinate clauses on the order of words in a following principal clause (Ch. VII).

For some of these phenomena M. Franzén offers an acceptable explanation; but for several of the most important his explanation is hardly satisfying. He fails at times (e.g. in his first paragraph) to bear in mind the difference between sense emphasis and phonetic stress, which (as he recognizes on pp. 40 ff.) need not go together, especially in French. In general, he is reluctant to admit the influence of accentual rhythm (though he invokes it—with some confusion between stress and tone—to account for the insertion of the pronoun in the parenthetical *dist il*, etc.); yet it seems probable that only considerations of stress and rhythm can explain the initial impulse towards generalization of the personal pronoun subject in French as compared with other Romance languages. It is not very helpful to attribute the generalization to '*une tendance à exprimer le sujet avant le verbe, l'agent avant l'action*' (p. 138), without showing why such a tendency should be so much stronger in French than elsewhere. When he ventures beyond the strict limits of his subject M. Franzén is sometimes unfortunate, as for example in his digression on grammatical subordination (pp. 93 ff.), where he joins issue with Lerch. The real value of his book consists in the detailed information that it gives on the facts of Old French usage in the matter of the omission, insertion and position of subject-pronouns.

T. B. W. REID.

MANCHESTER.

La Petite Philosophie. Edited by WILLIAM HILLIARD TRETHEWEY. (*Anglo-Norman Text Society*, 1.) Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1939. lxx + 159 pp. 30s.

This elegantly produced volume inaugurates the series of Anglo-Norman Texts. *La Petite Philosophie* is an excellent choice for the purpose, for, although almost painfully dull, it is representative of one of the most numerous and most characteristic classes of Anglo-Norman works. The preponderance of religious and didactic texts in Anglo-Norman is a well-known fact: amongst these the religious encyclopaedia is conspicuous. *La Petite Philosophie* is a short and typical example. It is a translation of most of the first of the *De imagine mundi libri tres* formerly ascribed to Honorius of Autun, with some interpolations, mostly pious passages of the usual kind based upon Honorius's *Elucidarium*. The sole originality of this text appears to be a peculiar view of marriage bordering upon Mahomedanism (ll. 2676–2719, cf. pp. lv, lvi). The work is unfortunately anonymous, unlike so many of its type.

There are seven MSS., of which two are fragments. The text is based upon the Wakefield MS., and the use made of the other MSS. is explained on pp. lvii, lviii.

The volume consists of introduction, text, notes and vocabulary. In all sections, the editor has had to consider economy of space, so that the

introduction is concise, and the variants, notes and glossary are selective. He has acquitted himself well in the distasteful but all-too-common task of keeping within bounds.

Professor Trethewey gives a clear short analysis of the language of the poem, and also a list of the main scribal peculiarities of his basic MS. One may, however, be permitted to wonder whether it would not be advisable to work backwards in Anglo-Norman. Thus on pp. xxxi-ii, it might have been stated that mute *e* is already on the way to becoming a sign of pronounced final consonants. Various points of detail might be raised, e.g. on p. xl *ke=qua* would have been clearer than *ke=kar*, and on p. xli the indefinite and partitive articles are confused. The distinction between pronunciation and spelling, not always observed by writers on Anglo-Norman, has been remarkably well sustained. The editor has dealt admirably with the thorny question of versification (pp. xlv-xlvii).

The production of the volume is excellent. It is a pity that the introduction is marred by so many lapses in grammar, vocabulary and spelling. *Expunctuate* would appeal to Humpty Dumpty. The text, the main concern of the Society, is clearly set out and the fruit of arduous and conscientious preparation.

It is unfortunate that the Society should have had to break ground for the first time in this troubled year.

M. DOMINICA LEGGE.

OXFORD.

L'Épopée française: origine et élaboration. By MAURICE WILMOTTE.
Paris: Boivin. 1939. ix+217 pp. 40 fr.

Professor Wilmotte's book will be gratefully received by French specialists and by all who have to deal with medieval heroic poems. To the former he recalls many thoughts which are still not exhausted and suggests new possibilities; the latter he brings abreast of French research. Owing to the central position of medieval French literature, any important new doctrine—such as that of M. Bédier—gives rise to a vast number of calculations and readjustments in neighbouring studies, of which perhaps the specialist in French is hardly aware. In the nature of things these other scholars cannot follow Old French researches from day to day, so that they have special reason for gratitude when an acknowledged master like M. Wilmotte calls a halt in his studies and takes a look round.

An intensely interesting feature of this book is the review of lost scholarship entitled 'Un siècle de philologie française: 1810-1904'. It becomes evident how ingenious and bold was the thinking of our predecessors and how much of it could be used as a platform for novel developments. New thoughts are very often old thoughts which have come to life again; and, on the other hand, in the dust of present-day controversy or in our zeal to exploit a particular vein we lose sight of things that were familiar to our ancestors. Gaston Paris is M. Wilmotte's hero, but he has stimulating things to say about Fauriel, Villemain, Gautier and others. To a student of literary history it is some consolation

to learn to say 'non omnis moriar', for criticism is also creative and retains its own element of truth even after the fashionable style has changed.

In 'Les thèses nouvelles sur l'origine de l'épopée' our author gives an account of M. Bédier's views, and shows a certain coolness. My impression is that more gratitude could be shown for the destructive side of Bédier's work. His chapter on 'Les seize Guillaumes' was a masterpiece of lambent irony which completely demolished a certain school of interpreters. But for that chastening the sixteen Williams might—under the goad of more and more desperate doctoral theses—have become sixty. On the positive side, however, it has become evident that the indications on which Bédier relied represent only a microscopic part of the interests involved in the *chansons de geste*. His argument thus tended to incur the fault he had discovered among adherents of the historical school: the fault of esteeming the part above the whole, and wrenching the whole so that the parts should fall into a neat pattern. Pilgrimages had something to do with the *chansons de geste* and even some of the Williams were relevant, but the *chanson* itself was bigger than the historical or monastic interests.

It is to the *chanson* as a whole that M. Wilmotte devotes the chapters on 'L'épopée latine' and 'Les éléments constitutifs de l'épopée française'. These pages deal with new lines of thought and conclusions as yet incompletely established. The pathfinding work of E. Curtius receives sympathetic mention. The latter's articles 'Zur Literaturästhetik des Mittelalters' (*Z.R.P.* LVIII) have already the dimensions of a book. They are admittedly tentative, and at one point have incurred correction (see R. Menéndez Pidal's rejoinder in *Z.R.P.* LIX), but this manner of approach has the advantage of being directed towards the existing texts, and not to hypothetical forms or selected parts. In a related discipline Professor J. G. C. Anderson has shown that, as the *Germania* was written in accordance with an established literary convention, we are excused arguing whether Tacitus meant to depict a practicable Utopia or to satirize Roman civilization by implication—modern judgements of his work that can be supported only by excerpting extracts. Similarly, when we find the *Chanson de Roland* broken by the death of the hero, it is pertinent to know that the contemporary aesthetic did not demand unity of plot; if anything, it eschewed it. Even under classical conditions unity of plot was limited to the single genre of tragedy, and it was Torquato Tasso who first thought to extend it to a second genre. Informed criticism consists of understanding a work composed under its own conventions and interpreting it in terms understood by the critic's public. There are obvious limitations to the application of principles drawn from medieval Rhetorics and Poetics. The discussion may tend to become bookish. One has to remember that these epics were practical successes or failures, and that much that puzzles us when judging (as the phrase goes) from a purely literary standpoint may have been due to conditions of performance.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

La Chanson de Floovant. Étude critique et édition, par F. H. BATESON.
Loughborough. 1938. 171 pp.

This new edition of the chanson de geste of *Floovant* is very welcome: the poem had only been published once before, in 1858, by Michelant and Guessard in the rather rare series 'Les Anciens Poètes de la France'.

Only one manuscript of *Floovant* is known, and the edition reproduces it closely, only making changes where the sense or metre seem to demand it (there are a few minor inaccuracies in the transcription: they are corrected in *Romania*, LXV, 246). Two fragments of another manuscript were discovered some years ago, and these are of course included in the edition; it might, however, have been more convenient to print them as an appendix rather than introduce them into the text of the Montpellier manuscript. A comprehensive glossary and an index of proper names are given after the text.

The Introduction deals with the legend of Floovant and with the language of the poem. After a useful summary of the various versions of the story (French, Italian, Dutch and Icelandic), there is a critical discussion of the theories put forward by different scholars—Darmesteter, Rajna and others—in attempting to trace the growth of the legend and to find a historical person who would correspond to Floovant. Most readers will undoubtedly agree with Mr Bateson in rejecting the idea of a lost poem going back to the sixth or seventh century, and will be more inclined to see in the chanson de geste, as he does, a creation of the twelfth century. He suggests ('une théorie nouvelle', pp. 38 ff.) that the creator of the story took the opening incident, where the young Floovant cuts off his tutor's beard and has to flee from court, either directly or indirectly from the *Gesta Dagoberti*, and, realizing that it would make a good beginning for a chanson de geste, added to it incidents from the common stock of the epics of the time. This part of the theory is supported by comparisons with such poems as the *Chevalerie Ogier* and *Fierabras*.

This certainly seems the most reasonable suggestion put forward so far to explain the genesis of the poem. The name Floovant, 'descendant of Clovis', however, remains rather mysterious. Mr Bateson suggests that it was substituted for that of Dagobert as being more general. 'Dagobert' would not have been suitable, as only one incident is connected with him. It is frankly admitted, however, that the form with an initial FL is unexpected in a twelfth-century author, and it is only very tentatively that Mr Bateson suggests that the author may have found it in a MS. of the Merovingian period.

The last part of the Introduction deals with the language of the poem. Analysing the dialect of the scribe, Mr Bateson agrees with Michelant and Guessard that it is 'lorrain', but he points out that the assonances show no trace of the dialect, and represent the language of the Ile-de-France.

At the beginning of the book is inserted a biographical note on the author, who died in 1938, aged 32. His death at such an early age will

be deeply regretted not only by his many friends but by all Romance scholars.

B. WOLEDGE.

LONDON.

The Romance of Tristan by Beroul. Edited by A. EWERT. Volume I. Oxford. Basil Blackwell. 1939. xv + 176 pp. 9s.

Professor Ewert's edition of Beroul's *Tristan* is a very welcome addition to the Old French texts available for English students. The glossary is much fuller than that in the—out-of-print—*Classiques français du moyen-âge* edition and should be fully adequate to the needs of Honours students.

This text has been much worked upon, but its latest editor is very far indeed from being a mere echo of his predecessors. An estimate of his personal contribution is made easy by the useful *apparatus criticus*, which gives not only the variants of the MS. but also those of Muret's last edition, as well as certain emendations from other quarters. There are many divergences from Muret. Even where his text is the same, Professor Ewert frequently gives it a personal interpretation by punctuating it differently. He rejects numerous emendations by other scholars, and, when he adopts them, he does not always attribute the same sense to them; as when he explains *avoé* (line 1030) as *avoué*, not *avoïé*, which was Professor Tanguerey's interpretation. He has been much more chary of tampering with the text than Muret, and his edition gives a more accurate picture of the state of the declension at the period, in contrast to the arbitrary correctness introduced by Muret.

The present volume contains only the text, with a glossary and a short introduction, which lists the previous editions, describes the MS. and the method followed in editing it. Judgement upon some of the editor's readings and interpretations must be suspended until the appearance of the second volume, which is to include a study of the language. Thus, *a mis sa peine* (line 4368) doubtless gives a more satisfactory sense than Muret's *a mis sa poigne*, but, from Muret's account of the language, the interpretation 'peine' seems to be excluded by the rhyme *esloigne*. Again, in line 2814, the retention of the MS. reading *lois* = ambiguous, uncertain(?)—Muret has *voirs* and, in earlier editions, *cois*—arouses curiosity about Professor Ewert's eventual commentary.

The reference in the glossary under *aumuce* to line 3650 is incorrect. In line 1404 *il* seems to be a misprint for *li*.

LONDON.

CLAUDINE I. WILSON.

Floire et Blancheflor. Edition critique avec commentaire par MARGARET PELAN. (*Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg. Textes d'Étude.* 7.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 1937. 235 pp. 25 fr.

Flore et Blancheflor, nach der Pariser Handschrift 375 (A) mit Glossar, neu herausgegeben. Im Anhang: Lesarten der Handschriften fs. fr.

1447 (B), der Handschrift fs. fr. 12562 (C), und vollständiger Abdruck von Pal. lat. 1971. By WILHELMINE WIRTZ. (*Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen zur germanischen und romanischen Philologie*. Heft 15.) Frankfurt am Main. Moritz Diesterweg. 1937. 190 pp. RM. 6.

Jusque dans ces dernières années les seules éditions qu'on pouvait—et encore avec quelle difficulté!—se procurer de *Floire et Blanche flor* étaient celle d'Immanuel Bekker, *Flore und Blanceflor*, altfranzösischer Roman, nach der Uhlandischen Abschrift der Pariser Handschrift N. 6987, Berlin, 1844, et celle d'Edélestand du Méril, *Floire et Blanche flor* (et non *Blanche flor*, comme l'imprimeur M. Pelan, p. 31, et W. Wirtz, p. 13), Poèmes du XIII^e siècle publiés d'après les manuscrits avec une introduction, des notes et un glossaire, Paris, 1856.

Après un entr'acte presque séculaire il a paru coup sur coup trois nouvelles éditions de ce gracieux roman, les deux dont nous nous occupons ici, plus celle de Felicitas Krueger, *Li roman de Floire et Blanche flor*, in beiden Fassungen, nach allen Handschriften, mit Einleitung, Namenverzeichnis und Glossar, *Romanische Studien*, Heft 45. Berlin, 1938

Cette dernière édition donne la version dite 'aristocratique' et la version dite 'populaire'. Celles de M. Pelan et de W. Wirtz ne publient que la version 'aristocratique', et ne prennent comme base qu'un MS., quitte à corriger les fautes et à combler les lacunes en recourant à un autre manuscrit. M. Pelan choisit *B* (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, 1447), W. Wirtz choisit *A* (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, 375). Chacune trouve—naturellement—d'excellents arguments pour justifier sa préférence. Pour M. Pelan *B* semble 'offrir constamment de meilleures leçons que *A*' et les vers de *A* qui manquent dans *B* lui paraissent 'le plus souvent des interpolations inutiles, les vers de *B* qui manquent dans *A* le plus souvent des vers utiles'. De son côté, W. Wirtz s'en tient à l'opinion que Du Méril exprime dans son *Introduction* (pp ccv-ccix), et elle ajoute. 'Fluchtigkeitsfehler und Auslassungen sind in *B* häufiger als in *A*.' Et nous voilà bien avancés! En réalité, dans un cas pareil il faut choisir: ou donner une reproduction diplomatique du MS. qu'on a choisi et renoncer à une édition critique, ou s'attacher à l'établissement d'un texte en utilisant tous les matériaux dont on dispose. Le moyen terme auquel se sont arrêtées les deux éditrices ne peut satisfaire personne. Chose singulière, d'ailleurs, en bien des passages c'est encore à Du Méril que revient la palme. Et pourtant M. Pelan et W. Wirtz avaient un supplément des plus précieux et que l'érudit français n'avait pas connu: le fragment de 1156 vers, celui que Karl Christ a découvert et décrit dans *Die altfranzösischen Handschriften der Palatina*, Leipzig, 1916. Certes nous leur savons gré de l'avoir publié; mais quel dommage de n'en avoir pas tiré le parti qui convenait! Nous ne pouvons à ce sujet, non plus qu'à d'autres points de vue, rentrer ici dans le détail. Nous renverrons donc, pour plus ample information, aux comptes-rendus de A. Jeanroy, *Romania*, LXIII (1937), pp. 534-535 et de E. Gamillscheg, *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, Band LXII, Heft 7, 8 (1939), pp. 437-452. En ce même fascicule, pp. 452-461, E. Gamillscheg examine aussi

la publication de Felicitas Krueger, citée plus haut. Il ne la considère pas non plus comme suffisante. La question d'une édition critique de *Floire et Blancheflor* reste donc entière.

LOUIS BRANDIN.

LONDON.

Les Poésies personnelles de Rutebeuf (Étude linguistique et littéraire suivie d'une édition critique du texte avec commentaire et glossaire). By HARRY LUCAS. Strasbourg. 1938. 137 pp.

Whilst awaiting a complete edition of Rutebeuf's works, a publication which makes even a portion of them more available to the public than they have been up till now is welcome. Dr Lucas has presented as his 'thèse de doctorat' a careful edition of what he designates 'les poésies personnelles' of Rutebeuf accompanied by a linguistic and literary appreciation, notes and a glossary. He has adopted the same nomenclature for the manuscripts as Kressner in his edition of 1885 and has based the text of five out of the seven poems on the manuscript (A) contained in the famous 'recueil' entitled *Dicts, blasons et contes divers*, of which a facsimile was published in 1932. In the case of Poem 6 (*La Povretei Rutebeuf*), which is contained only in a single manuscript (C), the original text has been preserved in spite of marked dialectal features, instead of an effort being made, as in Kressner's edition, to 'franciser' the language and the orthography of the original. The notes which accompany the text are helpful and give translations of some of the lines of difficult interpretation. One or two of these translations fail to give a very convincing meaning of the text. The obscure line in *Le Marriage Rutebeuf*, '[or puis filer] qu'il me faut traime', can hardly mean '[je puis donc continuer mon conte], puisqu'il me manque de quoi m'habiller', since the same expression is applied to God in the poem *Les Plaines du Monde* (l. 5): 'Par tens li (=Dieu) est failli traime', and l. 128 ('qui auques a, privé le prent') in Poem 2 (*La Complainte Rutebeuf*) does not mean 'celui qui a des biens, qu'il les garde pour lui-même'; *prend* is not subjunctive and Rutebeuf's complaint is the same as that in *La Povretei* (l. 18), 'Dou sien gardeir est chacuns sages'—a frequent lament in the poems of that epoch.

The text of the poems is preceded by a useful survey of the language and versification, after which Dr Lucas passes on to an 'étude littéraire'. Here the impression given is that the author, by confining himself to the 'poésies personnelles', has conceived a somewhat one-sided view of the poet's character. He points out very truly that the subject of each of the seven poems in question is the poet's mode of life and that in them all he describes the misery of his condition and that of others of his class. This leads Dr Lucas to refer to him rather too frequently as 'ce pauvre diable', 'ce pauvre hère', 'un pauvre hère comme Rutebeuf', 'ce truand', 'ce parasite'. These epithets contain an element of truth, but it has often been pointed out that lamentations about poverty, an exacting wife ('une vraie mégère' as Dr Lucas rather unkindly calls the

poor half-starved lady), fickle friends and vanished patrons are not uncommon at that epoch, nor was it considered a disgrace to hunt at payment in kind for literary work. When we think of the valiant champion of Guillaume de St Amour, who dared to raise his voice against all the religious corporations of his time and even to threaten the pope and the king with divine justice (cf. *Li Diz de Maître Guillaume de Saint Amour, comme il fut escilliez*); when we remember the eloquent poem put into the mouth of Sainte-Église, beginning with the words so reminiscent of the prophet Jeremiah:

Vous qui alez parmi la voie,
Arrestez-vous et chascuns voie
S'il est dolor tel com la moie,

these epithets seem patronizing and exaggerated. Strange to say, too, in the enumeration of the *genres* cultivated by Rutebeuf, no mention is made of the drama, and the *Miracle de Théophile*, the work by which Rutebeuf is perhaps best known at the present day, is completely ignored. From this point of view the 'poésies personnelles' do not give quite the complete idea of the author's talent which Dr Lucas claims for them (Introd. p. 56) and the publication of the remaining works contemplated by the editor will doubtless contribute to a more balanced view of the poet's work.

JESSIE CROSLAND.

LONDON.

L'Œuvre de Marguerite d'Angoulême, Reine de Navarre, et la Querelle des Femmes. By EMILE V. TELLE. Toulouse: Imprimerie Toulousaine Lion et Fils. 1937. 417 pp.

This scholarly and businesslike study is in no sense a re-hash or inflation of part of Jourda's monumental volumes on Marguerite de Navarre published in 1930; it is natural that M. Telle should have made use of Jourda's work and it is with the latter's encouragement that this examination of a particularly interesting aspect of Marguerite's work has been carried out. There is new light on Marguerite herself and there is new light on the complex body of writings usually lumped together as the *Querelle des Femmes*. I would commend the reflexions on the *Quinze Joyes*, pp. 11-12, and on Chrestien de Troyes, pp. 16 *sqq.*

This dispute, as M. Telle rightly and with much careful analysis of the evidence points out, was in the Middle Ages rather misogynistic than misogynistic; moreover, it became, in its later stages, a literary exercise, an academic debate, devoid of sincerity and choked with erudition of a kind. The continuation of this literature in the early days of the Renaissance was replaced, about the middle of the century, by a new set of ideas and arguments. The new 'feminism' demanded for women the respect of the male sex, the fidelity of husband to wife, the rehabilitation of marriage and the right to learning. An appropriate background is provided by a useful study of the legal position of women and a sketch of the nature of French literature at the court of François I. M. Telle

here abandons the old, over-simple division of literature dealing with women into *courtois* and *gaulois* and shows that the currents of thought and literature may be more usefully classified as polemical, Court (not *courtois*), platonic and matrimonial. All of these currents are then examined as they occur in the works of Marguerite, with useful comparisons with her contemporaries, her predecessors and successors.

There is no polemic in the Queen's work, nor indeed is there any systematic treatment of the feminist problem in her writings. The striking characteristic of her attitude is her reasonableness and equity, resting chiefly on the view that before God men and women are equal; they are the *Rien* in face of the *Tout* of God. Man should be not only woman's head, but her example and model; God's laws are the same for both, but man has the greater responsibility. The evangelical and moral notes pervade her whole work, the *Heptaméron* and the *Poésies courtoises* as well as the religious poems. All problems are seen in the light of the relationship of the *Tout* and the *Rien*.

This attitude underlies all the 'currents' of Marguerite's ideas, whether she be taking part in the 'Querelle des Amyes', in the debate on Platonic conceptions of love (her own unsystematic system has a platonist or Ficinian exterior profoundly modified by Christian faith), in the movement (helped in curiously twisted fashion by the Reformers) for the rehabilitation of the conjugal state or, by example as well as by precept, in the conquest of learning by her sex.

H. W. LAWTON.

SOUTHAMPTON.

Le Thème de Phèdre et d'Hippolyte dans la littérature française. By WINIFRED NEWTON. Paris: Droz. 1939. 166 pp. 24 fr.

This is a competent piece of research that promises better to come. The author has carefully compared nine dramas and one poem dealing with the Phedra story before Racine, and a similar number since, thus giving a comprehensive account of the theme in French literature from Garnier to Zola and contemporary novelists. A central chapter on Racine's play and an appendix of textual parallels make it an adequate study of its subject; it might indeed have been more than this had Racine's play been studied with the same care as the minor plays.

Whether these dramas are more than isolated and spasmodic works, whether one can speak of 'la conception française du sujet' (p. 140) as opposed to that of Euripides and Seneca is an open question. An even more vital matter of method is the distinction between parallel and influence. The author does not discuss either of these, but is on the whole discerning, fair and prudent not to state more than the facts warrant. But she more than once speaks of Racine 'reacting' against his French predecessors, implying that he knew them, and ends the chapter on Racine with this astonishing passage: 'L'influence de Garnier, de La Pinelière, de Grenaille et Tristan, de Gilbert et de Bidar, se retrouve différemment manifestée, dans la répartition du matériel tragique, dans

le choix de certains épisodes, dans leur détail, et dans la conception du caractère de certains personnages. Elle est donc considérable, et si elle se fait sentir tout autrement que l'influence de Sénèque et d'Euripide, elle n'en est pas moins évidente ni moins importante. L'originalité de Racine réside dans l'emploi qu'il fait de ces éléments empruntés' (p. 123). The parallels are interesting, the similarity of taste and arrangement of material is undoubted, but 'considerable' (or indeed any) influence is quite unproven. The real defect in this study is that the originality of Racine is never taken into account. It is pointless to discuss what an artist borrowed before trying to discern what he invented.

W. G. MOORE.

OXFORD.

Chateaubriand. A biography. By JOAN EVANS. London: Macmillan. 1939 xiii+380 pp 12s 6d.

Writers of genius who themselves tell their life-story bequeath a difficult task to their biographers. The scholar who attempts a life of Jean-Jacques Rousseau or Chateaubriand is challenging comparison with incomparable passages in the *Confessions* or in *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, and, however brilliant the biography, it can hardly hope to be more than a pale reflexion of what has been superlatively achieved. The biographer, it is true, may be more trustworthy, but even then his book cannot vie in colour and intensity with the original.

In this new biography of Chateaubriand Miss Evans has tackled this problem boldly and no one can reproach her on recognizing the original Chateaubriand prose shining again and again through the translation, for she announces that, in closely following the best source—*Mémoires d'outre-tombe*—she has often used its very words. The inaccuracies and discrepancies, the modifications that natural vanity and the sense of drama dictated to Chateaubriand have been checked by reference to the *Correspondance générale* and to the substantial mass of material that recent research has accumulated.

The work has been very well done. The volume has all the charm of the better *biographies romancées*, but one can read it with confidence and without the unpleasant feeling of treading on moving ground, the uncertainty as to whether any particular incident is authentic or whether the biographer has drawn on 'intuition'. Miss Evans's story, slow-moving but very attractively written, unfolds, incident by incident, the extraordinarily varied existence of Chateaubriand and reveals the character of the man as well as his day to day existence in Brittany, America, England and Italy and his journeyings between Paris and the East. From Chateaubriand his biographer has learned the art of presenting events in a series of vivid pictures. As a result the multiplicity of details does not clog the narrative but adds to its attractiveness.

The colourful, interesting, variegated life of the sulky, histrionic charmer provides first-rate material, and the success of Miss Evans lies in the fact that she makes full use of the possibilities of her subject. The

American journey, the exile in London and Suffolk, the domestic relations of Chateaubriand and Céleste are all told with zest and leave a lively impression. The basic elements in Chateaubriand's personal character are picturesquely indicated. the perennial boyishness which made him, an Ambassador on his way to Dover, sing, dance and attempt to shin up the ship's mast, his exhibitionism which prompted him, then a free-thinker, to insist on preaching a Good Friday sermon to the crew of the *Saint-Pierre*, his egoism, which does not appear to have hampered him in his feminine friendships. Miss Evans aptly quotes one of his victims, Madame de Montcalm. 'With these geniuses who express feeling so well, feeling does not last long. Their esteem and trust do not lead to affection. They are so ardently taken up with themselves that they care for nothing outside. Once they have got hold of you, they will take no more trouble, for they know that they can keep you for ever even without reciprocity of feeling.'

This excellent biography can be read with pleasure as a study in human nature even by those not particularly interested in Chateaubriand's literary works. There are a few slips. The anniversary of the fall of the Bastille is not, of course, 24 July (p. 80); wasps do not 'bite' dragomans or others (p. 208); on p. 357 it seems to be suggested that Flaubert was 'in the forefront' of the literary world before Chateaubriand's death in 1848; and the epithet 'young cub' (p. 348) applied to the Lamartine of the *Jocelyn* period is hardly appropriate, for Lamartine was then forty-six.

F. C. ROE.

ABERDEEN.

The Fortunes of Victor Hugo in England. By K. W. HOOKER. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1938. xiii + 333 pp. 14s.

So much has been written about the reception accorded in France to English writers that it is a pleasure to announce a book with the title *The Fortunes of Victor Hugo in England*. May it prove to be the harbinger of a *comparatiste* renaissance. Yet, in choosing Hugo as his subject, Mr Hooker set himself a difficult task. The substance of a Montaigne or a Rousseau is little affected by translation and is readily exportable. The best of Hugo is in a different case. It is significant, as Mr Hooker shows, in his fourth chapter, that Hugo's lyric poetry was judged in this country on the merits of 'feeble and halting' adaptations. Indeed, the only competent interpreters of his early poems in England were foreigners, notably Mazzini. Mr Hooker thinks very reasonably that the only Hugo ever really well known to the English reading public was the Hugo of the great novels. Even then, his first success, *Notre Dame*, was a *succès de scandale*.

Hernani, which aroused such a literary war in France, created little stir over here and, translated as *The Pledge or Castilian Honour*, ran only for eight nights. *Marion Delorme* and *Marie Tudor* were not presented in English dress, but that did not prevent the critics from condemning

them as licentious. *Le Roi s'amuse*, bowdlerized by Dr Mellinger, pleased our audiences despite the violent attacks on the French original printed in the *Foreign Quarterly* which thought it poor 'as a scenic affair' and anti-monarchical in tone. In 1833 the *Quarterly Review* started a vicious campaign against the French stage in general and the theatre of Hugo in particular. In this it was ably backed by *The Edinburgh, Blackwood's* and other journals. Taken collectively, their pronouncements display the worst features of English journalism of the period—insularity, cant, vituperation and critical impotence. But their mass effect, over a period of seven years, was to brand Hugo as a thoroughly immoral person.

In Chapter vi, Mr Hooker gives an interesting and detailed account of Hugo's vicissitudes in the Channel Islands where his intervention on behalf of the murderer Tapner was the first of a suite of indiscretions which earned for him the reputation of a meddler. He did nothing to help matters by his *Lettre à Louis Buonaparte* which he entrusted to the Jersey exiles who were to demonstrate on the occasion of the Emperor's visit to our Queen. As is well known, Hugo's famous *Déclaration* reminding us of Napoleon's crimes, led to the poet's transfer from Jersey to Guernsey. Ironically enough, however, these political events gave Hugo more publicity than he had ever got from his literary works. The death of his daughter, Léopoldine, added to his other misfortunes, drew sympathetic attention to the author of the *Contemplations*. This, however, was forfeited when the *Légende des Siècles* appeared. True, Hugo's name was now bracketed in England with that of Alfred Tennyson, but usually to emphasize the contrast between the beauty and goodness of the English poet and the 'religious blasphemies' and 'indecencies' of the Frenchman.

But, about 1870, Hugo came into his English kingdom. *Les Misérables*, though wholeheartedly damned by every reviewer except Swinburne and, curiously enough, the *Quarterly*, was enthusiastically read by the public. As Mr Hooker points out, Hugo now began to appear in our press as the typical or representative Frenchman—immoral, artificial, exaggerated, subversive. This view was fortified by the appearance of *Les Travaillleurs de la Mer* and especially by *L'Homme qui Rit* which horrified the critics, again with the exception of Swinburne who perversely disagreed. Yet, despite the wide publicity given to its 'indecencies' the latter novel was never rated so high as its predecessors. With *Quatre Vingt Treize*, Hugo finally smashed all opposition. The public bought it in thousands; *Blackwood's* admitted the author into the company of the great English masters, and R. L. S., in the *Cornhill*, placed the seal on Hugo's reputation as a novelist by his *Victor Hugo's Romances*. This article is the first competent survey of Hugo's achievement in the realm of fiction.

Mr Hooker indicates as the 'High Tide' of Hugo's English prestige as a novelist in this country the years from 1874 to his death in 1885. This period also represents roughly the climax of his success in this country as a poet. Mr Hooker, in this connexion, speaks of the inspiration derived at this time from French literature by Wilde, Moore, Symonds and

Yeats whilst admitting that the Parnassians and Symbolists whom they cultivated regarded Hugo as a 'back number'. His argument is that, nevertheless, Hugo, because of his technical skill, was still a force to be reckoned with and 'was granted the titular crown of French poetry'. Personally, I wish he had discussed this interesting anomaly at greater length. What is beyond doubt is that Hugo now had efficient and enthusiastic champions in England such as Swinburne, Dowden and, to some extent, Tennyson, and that his genius as a poet was not questioned by cultured Englishmen. The final chapters, which deal with the decline of Hugo's reputation in England since his death, express the view that as poet and novelist he has failed to hold the English public. Before subscribing to this melancholy verdict, I think that most of Mr Hooker's readers will demand more conclusive evidence than what he offers us in the final chapters of a study which in other respects deserves unstinted praise.

F. C. GREEN.

CAMBRIDGE.

Sainte-Beuve à l'Académie de Lausanne. Chronique du cours sur Port-Royal 1837-1838. Par RENÉ BRAY. Lausanne: Faculté des Lettres; Paris: Droz. 1937. 368 pp. 6 fr suisses.

Sainte-Beuve Port-Royal. Le Cours de Lausanne. Publié sur le manuscrit de Chantilly par JEAN POMMIER. 1^{re} Partie: le texte. Paris: Droz. 1937. xxiv + 649 pp.

The bulk of these two volumes is not out of proportion to their importance. It is an excellent thing that our attention should be recalled to the minute details of the preparation of one of the great books of the nineteenth century, in the one case to all that can be recovered of Sainte-Beuve's connexion with Lausanne, in the other to what remains of the text of the lectures he there gave. The distinguished work of Michaut and Giraud (and of Pommier himself, whose important article appeared in the *Revue d'hist. et philos.* of 1934, not 1935, Bray, pp. 38, 360) is thus extended, and an important literary episode can now be fully studied.

Sainte-Beuve's visit to Lausanne makes a strange story. It would seem that he almost suggested the idea of a course of lectures to his friends (Bray, p. 20). He had already sought so to lecture in Geneva and in London. Yet when the invitation was given he could not make up his mind. Bellessort's phrase 'Il n'hésita pas à l'accepter' (*Sainte-Beuve et le 19^e siècle*, p. 176) cannot stand against Bray's close analysis of these months. Ambition urged him to go and love to stay, and in the end 's'il accepta... ce fut parce qu'Adèle ne le retint pas' (Bray, p. 46).

During seven and a half months in the city he accomplished what for most men would have been a lifetime's critical labour. He lectured (for an hour and a quarter) three times a week, was accessible to nobody before four o'clock in the afternoon and kept to his room in the Hotel

d'Angleterre, working almost without respite. 'La nature, malgré ses voiles fréquents, serait encore belle ici, si on avait le temps de lever la tête' (Bray, p. 213). Critics in Paris and Switzerland, the vast measure of his subject, the strain of his lectures, which robbed him of voice and sleep, his love affair, nothing could stop him. Those who know only the lax Sainte-Beuve will learn from Bray's pages that he was not boasting when he wrote 'Je n'ai baïllonné la plainte qu'à force de travail, et de travail encore' (p. 246). He had few natural gifts as a lecturer, yet the long course compelled admiration. 'A force de savoir mon sujet, de l'avoir écrit en cent façons, creusé en tout sens et exprimé par toutes les faces, je suis arrivé à paraître un professeur quasi éloquent. Hélas, si on en avait entendu de véritablement éloquent, on saurait la différence' (Bray, p. 273).

M. Bray has taken the trouble to reconstitute these months in such a fashion as to convey what M. Pommier happily calls 'cette ambiance vaudoise où Sainte-Beuve a professé'. He gives excellent information as to the state of the university at the time, the nature of the offer made to the critic, the press comments (unfavourable and laudatory) on the course, the rôle of Vinet throughout, listening, encouraging, interpreting the Parisian to Swiss opinion. This is all so reliably and vividly done that one would have welcomed perhaps an extra couple of chapters on how Sainte-Beuve used his materials to construct his course, how and when he read the enormous library that he brought and ordered from Paris, and what happened to the course in the years of its recasting into a book.

A great worker himself, Sainte-Beuve seems to have inspired men of like energy to study him. M. Pommier's 650 odd pages are the measure of what labour he has spent on transcribing and editing what remains of the text of the lectures, which is a little more than a third of the course. That this was worth reprinting as it stands is for him not in any doubt. With all respect, I am not so sure. Though this is the final part of the work, hence that which remained longest unpublished and in course of revision, there does not seem to be much difference between the first state and the last. Giraud has shown that Sainte-Beuve did not read all the important new publications on his field in the intervening years (*Port-Royal de Sainte-Beuve*, p. 30, n. 2). He has added some material, he has shortened some long quotations, he has cut the beginning and the end of lectures to make a more connected narrative, but beyond such obvious editing he does not seem to have had time to go. There is little evidence that I have been able to discover of real alteration of point of view or of atmosphere; passages which one might regard as characteristic of lecture or of book frequently appear in both. Would it have been wiser to publish variants in a full and critical edition rather than the course by itself? The question should not be answered perhaps until M. Pommier's second volume has appeared.

Certainly the text here published shows that the work as first built up lesson by lesson was a great work, great for that time in the patience and range of its erudition, in its judgements and its portraits. It is of

course personal too, in its exaggerations, in its sentiments, in its errors (apparently for Sainte-Beuve calvinist and methodist were synonymous terms, Bray, p. 235). Yet the great critic is constantly visible, in summary and phrase: 'la grandeur par la profondeur', 'la demi-réforme sur ce point comme sur tant d'autres'; often too in a pregnant conclusion to a great descriptive passage, as this on the death of Mère Angélique 'Pour nous même, simple historien, nul caractère dans notre sujet n'est véritablement plus grand, et plus royal, qu'elle, elle et Saint-Cyran' (Pommier, pp. 163, 164, 154).

The interest of the lectures so minutely analysed in these two volumes lies more in what they tell us of the nineteenth than of the seventeenth century. Sainte-Beuve's lectures, from which came his book, but the lectures more than the book, are, taken all in all, one of the dramatic phases in the long struggle of the French mind in the nineteenth century with the Christian religion. Dismayed by the inheritance of the eighteenth century, awakened by Lamennais, Sainte-Beuve allowed himself at Lausanne to be penetrated by Christianity, and (most significantly) at one and the same time by Catholic Jansenism and by Protestant Switzerland of the Réveil. He is insistent that he was not converted: 'J'ai écouté, j'ai goûté, j'ai admiré et senti. Vous savez bien que ce n'est pas là croire.' But it would be rash to estimate the gain to his later work from this experience that he sometimes wished to disavow. 'Lausanne a été pour lui une tentation chrétienne' (Bray, p. 351).

WILL G. MOORE.

OXFORD.

La Métaphore dans l'Œuvre de Stéphane Mallarmé By DEBORAH A. K. AISH. Paris: Droz. 1938. 210 pp. 30 fr.

This book is a thesis presented for the degree of Docteur de l'Université of Paris, and an excellent piece of work. Miss Aish has much to say that is interesting on Mallarmé's use of metaphor, and on his work in general. Perhaps in place of the term 'metaphor' it would be wiser to say simply 'word'. Degas once complained to Mallarmé that he could not write the poems he wished to, although his brain was overflowing with ideas. To which Mallarmé characteristically replied, 'Mais mon cher, on ne fait pas des poèmes avec les idées, mais avec les mots.' Mallarmé's originality, wherein he was followed by Valéry and some of the *surréalistes*, lay in acknowledging a very close correspondence between the structure of the cosmos and the architecture of a poem. While realizing to the full the implications of Baudelaire's famous correspondence theory and Théodore de Banville's rhyme theory, Mallarmé declared that the most important thing of all was the word. The word was even more important than rhyme, because word plus rhyme enabled the poet to arrest the perpetual flux of our inmost ideas. That, he held, was the secret of poetry's superiority over music: the poet can capture the aspect of things. (Who can say what is truth in music?) 'Pour Mallarmé,' as Miss Aish says, 'il s'agissait... de développer les qualités musicales innées de la littérature afin de

produire une musique plus parfaite, à cause de son abstraction pure, que celle des instruments.'

Mallarmé, like Baudelaire and de Banville, had absolute faith in an ineluctable relationship between the word and a certain reality which might even be the supreme reality, God. Mallarmé was followed by Paul Valéry, an essentially Cartesian mind for whom the importance of words consists as much in their suggestive shades as in their literal meaning, because they are endowed with a truly mystic virtue. This would seem to be a return to de Bonald's theory which recognized in art, in poetry, or in style, not only an obscure nature-force, but God himself. When Miss Aish says (p. 115) that Mallarmé 'ni athée ni païen ne croyait pas fermement à l'existence de Dieu', even supposing she were right, she is making an assertion which implies a considerable limiting of the mystical range of Mallarmé's thought. It is an audacious enterprise to deify the unconscious. Mallarmé, however, used to say: 'Et pourtant il y a un au delà.' Thibaudet's clear-sightedness discerned in the *angélisme* of Mallarmé's dream that purity-nostalgia which might well have led this friend of Mistral and Aubanel to a religious conception of life. The poet is indeed, as Victor Hugo claimed, a visionary. Mallarmé's visions were aided by his unflinching pursuit of analogy. Analogy became for him a veritable obsession whence evolved the profundity and subtlety of his poetic art. That is abundantly proved by his book *Mots Anglans*, about which Miss Aish has a good page (p. 25). One of the chapters of this thesis is aptly called *Le Démon de l'Analogie*. In it Miss Aish has many illuminating and subtle things to say, and its final summing up is excellent.

We could have wished that in treating of the absence theme, a theme of supreme importance in Mallarmé's work, Miss Aish had quoted more examples. Perhaps she hesitated to reproduce Thibaudet. In any case students of modern French poetry will find much that is helpful in this book.

GLADYS TURQUET-MILNES.

LONDON.

Le Dandysme dans l'œuvre de Jules Barbey d'Aurevilly. By ELIZABETH CREED. Paris: E. Droz. 1938. 132 pp.

Ce livre est consacré à l'auteur d'un *Traité* sur le dandysme qu'il a cultivé toute sa vie, dont il est le théoricien à la fois et l'historien. Citons quelques phrases marquant l'importance,—qu'on n'aurait peut-être pas soupçonnée,—de la question: 'Conventionnel, officiel, et extérieur au début (costume, pose, parole), le dandysme de Barbey se transforme peu à peu, après cette cristallisation intellectuelle qui s'exprime dans le *Traité*. L'artiste et le penseur lui donnent un nouveau sens, que renforcent son catholicisme et sa vocation normande. Il élève ainsi cette vogue anglaise à un plan supérieur et universel.'

Le dandysme de Barbey, qui enveloppe un art de vivre, a été surtout intérieur, comme celui de Baudelaire. Barbey se plaisait à en retrouver

une préfiguration chez des intellectuels détachés du monde comme Pascal et Rancé. Chez l'auteur des *Diaboliques*—incapable de voir dans la civilisation moderne autre chose que 'des usines et des latrines'—il a fini par devenir une manifestation de ses sentiments aristocratiques et par tourner au stoïcisme orgueilleux. 'Tête altière, attitude méprisante, ce nouveau dandy transforme sa coquetterie en rigueur stoïcienne, dans une vie qui fut ascétique.'

Miss Creed a discerné avec finesse les phases successives de cet état psychologique. Son travail, dont la forme n'est pas toujours exempte de lourdeur et d'obscurité, contribuera à mieux faire connaître l'écrivain et à nous éclairer sur l'histoire d'une mode d'origine anglaise, mais qui a subi des modifications caractéristiques en passant en France. Peut-être étudiera-t-elle quelque jour ce que Thibaudet appelait 'l'héroïsation du snobisme' chez Proust: nous en formons le vœu.

J. DECHAMPS.

LONDON.

The Novel of Adolescence in France the study of a literary theme. By JUSTIN O'BRIEN New York. Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1937. 240 pp. 12s. 6d.

Mr O'Brien's study covers the period between 1890—when adolescence becomes a problem in life and in literature—and 1930, when this theme shows sign of decline. Few novelists of this period failed to write a novel of adolescence; few have escaped Mr O'Brien's expert eye. Within the limits set, this survey offers valuable information and criticism.

Part I deals with the origin and growth of interest in adolescence, which began among novelists and spread to extra-literary circles. Mr O'Brien's analysis of A. Gide's contribution is illuminating, and one could wish for more intensive studies of this kind. A similar critical chapter on Cocteau would help to a better understanding of adolescent mentality to-day.

Part II (the Adolescent as represented in the novel) is based on psychological data, arranged under the following headings: the physical, intellectual and spiritual awakening, the sympathetic impulse; the egoistic impulse, spiritual unrest and disillusion. Mr O'Brien traces gradual changes in the novel of adolescence, and stresses the influence of the war. For him, the cult of Adolescence is the epitome of the post-war spirit.

This study might have been improved by a less arbitrary choice of dates. Though mention is made of *Louis Lambert*, *Étienne Mayran*, *Novembre*, and other early works on adolescence, there is no appreciation of Rousseau's *Confessions*, which hold the key to most later developments. By neglecting novels not dealing exclusively with adolescence Mr O'Brien has narrowed down his subject. Proust's method of analysis, for example, which has provided novelists with an instrument admirably suited to depicting the adolescent mind, should have been taken into consideration.

Moreover, Mr O'Brien has ignored the adolescence of girls. It is not enough to state that this problem is distinct from any other, and that few have tackled it. A chapter on Colette would have added breadth to his research.

Mr O'Brien quotes freely from the novels he studies; but owing to the special angle from which these have been approached, their literary value does not clearly stand out. On the other hand, it would be dangerous to judge adolescence on the evidence of a novelist who is often exploiting a theme, and who must, for the sake of the interest of that theme, indulge in over-statement. It is also doubtful whether the personal experience of a novelist is typical of his generation. Art is at best an incomplete reflexion of life, and its elusive connexion with reality would be difficult to trace in a study of the kind under review.

R. NIKLAUS.

MANCHESTER.

Paris—Théâtre contemporain. Deuxième Partie. By LOUISE DELPIT.
(*Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, Vol. xx, Nos. 1 and 2.)
Northampton, Mass : Smith College. Oct. 1938–Jan. 1939. 182 pp.
\$1.50.

Mlle Delpit, in this 'Tableau du mouvement dramatique en France de 1925 à 1938', gives us a sequel to her book, published in the same collection in 1925, dealing with the 'Rôle prépondérante des scènes d'avant-garde depuis trente ans'. She no longer confines herself to Antoine and the other pioneers, but covers the whole field of dramatic production during the last fourteen years, leaving aside only works utterly without claim to consideration as literature or as dramatic art.

The Introductory Chapter on the present state of the drama in Paris constitutes a useful conspectus. The theatres are classified and the various movements for renovation of the drama summarily indicated and defined. The remaining ten chapters form a repertory of dramatic production classed under suitable headings: religious, historical, action and terror, social, psychological, light, poetical, etc. Under each rubric the authors are classified alphabetically. Each author is briefly characterized and a list of his plays, arranged chronologically, with mention of the theatre at which they were performed, is appended. The subject and treatment of each play is briefly indicated, in many cases by quotations of contemporary critical notices in *Comœdia* and other periodicals. Exact references to these are provided in the footnotes. Full indexes make it easy to look up any author, play or critic.

By this careful and thorough inquiry Mlle Delpit has rendered signal service to all who set out to explore any section of recent French dramatic production. Despite the style of presentation—justified in a book intended for rapid reference—and the frequency of quotations, this book, illustrating strikingly the richness and variety of the contemporary

French theatre, can be read with profit and pleasure by anyone interested in the drama.

F. C. ROE.

ABERDEEN.

Annali Manzoni a cura del Centro di Studi Manzoni. Vol. I. Milano: Casa del Manzoni. 1939. 325 pp 50 lire.

Despite the difficulties that publishers through the world are lamenting, costly publications are being planned and undertaken in Italy, thanks to official support. They are mainly concerned with the issue of critical editions of the complete works of the principal authors; and it is to be noted that Michele Barbi, who appears to grow more energetic and youthful with the passing of years, is the guiding and inspiring force also behind the new Manzoni institute as he is in the case of several other similar undertakings. The object of the institution of the *Centro Nazionale di Studi Manzoni* is twofold: to preserve the home in which Manzoni lived in Milan and the unique collection of Manzoni autographs, relics, editions and critical studies which have been assembled and housed there, and to carry out a definitive edition of Manzoni's works. It has long been realized by scholars that despite the care that Manzoni bestowed on the correction and the revision of the printer's proofs, and perhaps because of this care, there occur some doubtful readings in the text of even the *Promessi Sposi*, for the copies of the first edition present a number of variants. As to his minor works, there are glaring errors in the text of some of his lyrics, and there are considerable omissions, at times caused by editorial restrictions, in the text of some of his critical works. The improvements which can be expected, however, in the text of the novel are relatively slight, while the more relevant changes concern articles and poems that are comparatively of a much smaller importance, but neither the former could be achieved, nor the latter established, except at the cost of immense labour, so that no scholar could be expected to undertake single-handed so thankless and so exacting a task, and no publisher could defray the very material expenditure required by the preparation and issue of a fully authoritative edition. Only a work planned on a scale so monumental and foreshadowing the issue of some forty volumes, could provide it; and the series of the *Annali Manzoni* is intended to help towards the attainment of the object in view, its first volume fully reveals the scope of the work that is undertaken by surveying the deficiencies which are to be remedied and the method by which such a result is to be obtained.

Giovanni Gentile, who presides over the Institute, shows in a penetrating article what Manzoni's work and personality mean to the present generation of Italians; and Barbi displays once again his uncanny editorial gifts by positing the critical problems involved and by suggesting the right way to their solution in his *Piano per un' edizione nazionale*. He tells the history of each text and its editions, and describes the difficulties and problems that the editors of the particular works must overcome, indicating the manuscript and printed sources which need to be taken

into account. It is an essay that seems leisurely and on the contrary bristles with complex questions that are triumphantly clarified, thanks to Barbi's information, as minutely accurate as it is wide in range, and to the masterly ease with which he marshals each piece of information into its place, however complicated the pattern.

F. Ghisalberti, who is entrusted with the edition of the novel, carries Barbi's survey a step further (*Per l'edizione critica dei Promessi Sposi*) by indicating the results that have already been reached through a close study of the variants in the different copies of the first edition on the lines suggested by Barbi in an earlier article.¹

Ghisalberti's contribution fully proves the validity of what Barbi had maintained, and of what he has more definitely stated in this volume. It has, however, long been Barbi's view that the preparation of a critical text implies the minute interpretation of the context; which amounts to saying that a commentary is implicit in a critical text. He now appears to go further, or rather to draw the ultimate consequences from his view, and to hold that a critical text should in most cases be accompanied by an interpretation, and corroborated as well as justified by it. Marigo's exemplary edition of Dante's *De vulgari eloquentia*, which was prepared under Barbi's direction, gives ample evidence of what is aimed at: and Manzoni's novel has been all too readily assumed to be easy and in no need of explanatory notes, precisely because it is a novel and written in modern days in a style that is apparently, as well as intentionally, quite simple. As this book is naturally prescribed in Italian schools, there have been produced numbers of school editions of it provided with notes which are intended to facilitate the understanding of this work to young people: and most of these commentaries have been rather perfunctorily undertaken by teachers who either did not think it worth while to look closely for the meaning of certain passages, or yielded to the temptation of making a show of their own originality by interpreting what Manzoni wrote in the light of their own conception of Manzoni's genius and personality, and not on the basis of what could be ascertained concerning his intentions and meaning. In order to reveal some of the pitfalls in which editors, the more thoughtful as well as the less careful, had fallen, Barbi lists here (*Note per un commento ai Promessi Sposi*) a series of passages which have been more or less grievously misunderstood, and shows in each case what the correct interpretation *must* be. It is a piece of scholarly criticism at its best, for no source of information and no check is overlooked: and the disconcerting result is that the immediate need of a reliable commentary of the *Promessi Sposi* is demonstrated with irresistible cogency. It is therefore to be expected that the new edition will fill a gap hitherto insufficiently realized. There are other advantages to be looked for from it, such as a truer history of the development of Manzoni's views on language, a more orderly sequence in the different drafts of some of his critical, historical and philosophical works necessarily

¹ 'Il testo dei Promessi Sposi' in *Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, Ser. II, vol. III (1934), pp. 439-68, reprinted in *La nuova filologia e l'edizione dei nostri scrittori da Dante al Manzoni*, Florence, 1938, pp. 195-227.

leading to a closer and deeper understanding of Manzoni's outlook and genius, but these advantages are dwarfed by comparison with the confident expectation of being enabled to enjoy his masterpiece more fully.

C. FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

Studies in Modern Romansh Poetry in the Engadine. By MILDRED ELIZABETH MAXFIELD. Cambridge, Mass. 1938. Planographed. xi+310 pp. From the author, Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wis., \$3 50; to Romansh people, or members of *Pro Grischun*, \$3.30 including postage.

This thesis, presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Radcliffe College and Harvard University, is to be warmly commended for the scholarly treatment of a subject which has been unjustly neglected. Miss Maxfield's decision to confine her attention to the poetry of one branch of the Romansh language, the Ladin of the Upper and Lower Engadine, was happily inspired. By further concentrating her investigations upon the three most important Engadine poets of the past hundred years she has achieved the precision which is not always found in studies of this kind and has been able to present Romansh poetry as something live and personal.

The three poets studied present an interesting contrast, and taken together they give a representative picture of Romansh poetic activity. Pallioppi (1820-73), lawyer and lexicographer, the more classical type of poet, formed by German and northern influences, but cultivating such forms as the terza rima, the sonnet and the Calabrian octave, Caderas (1830-91), bank clerk, journalist and editor by profession, the romantic type, with unmistakable traces of his Italian birth and early education, simpler and less self-critical, and Peider Lansel (born in 1863), businessman and consul, the more modern and eclectic poet, with interests less exclusively centring upon the Engadine. The productions of these three poets were not always easy to come by or to identify. Miss Maxfield has had to track them down in various collections, periodicals, manuscripts in private possession, and separate sheets. She has profited by personal contact with Peider Lansel and investigations on the spot, and has had access to note-books of Pallioppi and Caderas. The statistical tables given in the appendix and an admirable bibliography attest the thoroughness of her investigations.

A liberal selection of representative poems is reproduced and the English translations are accurate and generally pleasing. The poetic technique of each poet is analysed with perhaps a too excessive preoccupation with metrical form and insufficient regard to the handling of the resources of the language. A linguistic analysis was not part of Miss Maxfield's purpose, but one would have welcomed an attempt to characterize the vocabulary, to assess the amount of borrowing, etc.

While the author has not neglected other phases of the literary activity of these three writers, she has rightly concentrated upon their lyric poetry

and has fulfilled her purpose of presenting Romansh (Engadine) poetry of the past hundred years in its most characteristic form. The impression left on the reader is of a poetry which, while owing not a little to other literatures and giving a prominent place to translations and adaptations, has a character and vitality of its own. It is of a quality which gives added point to the recent decision to recognize Romansh as a fourth national language of Switzerland.

A. EWERT.

OXFORD.

Dicziunari Rumantsch Grischun. Publichà da la Società Retorumantscha . . fundà da ROBERT DE PLANTA e FLORIAN MELCHER: redacziun: CHASPER PULT ed ANDREA SCHORTA Prum fascicul A-ademplat. Cuoira. Bischofberger. 1938 96 pp. 2 maps.

The confidence which a dictionary inspires depends in the first instance on the reputation of its authors. If this initial criterion be applied to the new Rheto-Romance dictionary, we may assume that its matter will be as sound as its presentation is impeccable. Begun some thirty-five years ago, its chief sponsor, until the illness which preceded his death in 1937, was that distinguished Rheto-Roman Robert von Planta, well known to our classical colleagues for his scholarly work on the Osco-Umbrian dialects, in recent years the onus of production has fallen upon a Philological Commission, under the Presidency of Professor J. Jud; many of the other contributors, whom we had the pleasure of meeting in their workshop a year ago, have graduated from the Zürich seminar. We may therefore foresee that the coming dictionary will take its place as yet another monument to Swiss linguistic scholarship.

In all decentralized linguistic areas, where no norm of speech exists—we call to mind Catalonia, the Basque Country, Ireland—the makers of a dictionary are confronted by exceptional difficulties. The first problem is the choice of a central dialect to serve as a basis for the standard language which, for reasons political or merely cultural, they are seeking, consciously or unconsciously, to create. In the present case the dialect selected is that of the Lower Engadine; where the resources of this dialect are inadequate, words have been adopted from other dialects; but the dictionary retains its strictly scientific character in that the district to which each word belongs is carefully indicated, and other local forms are given in phonetic script after the chosen *Stichwort*. Nor do the authors incur the reproach directed against another dictionary-maker, namely, that he invented the examples of usage from his own speech; wherever possible the examples quoted are taken from existing Rheto-Romance literature. The dictionary is etymological and bilingual, explanations being in German.

The authors must have been considerably gratified when, on the eve of the work's going to press, Rheto-Romance was officially recognized as the fourth national language of Switzerland. This event, the fulfilment of a long-standing desire, implies the extended use of Rheto-Romance in education, and thereby confers upon the dictionary a new national

importance. Let us hasten to add, however, that our Rheto-Romance friends are no terrorists!

Since the first fascicule consists largely of introductory matter, we have as yet but a brief glimpse of the Rheto-Romance vocabulary as a whole. It is sufficient, however, to give us a general impression of the state of the language. Thus the presence of words of such incongruous appearance as *Abscheid*, *Abtritt*, and even *aber*, which has ousted the native *ma* and *mo* (and is written by some purists as *aver*!), indicates the strong influence both of the German-Swiss dialects and of literary German. (We wonder whether the adoption of German words with initial *ab* has not been helped by the frequency of this prefix in Rheto-Romance, *Abscheid* is accentuated in some dialects on the second syllable) Almost equally numerous, though less obvious, are the borrowings from Italian, e.g. *abatter*, *abbatimant*, *adafet*, *adaritura*, *adempimant*, a number of French words also appear, chiefly through the medium of literary German, e.g. *actur*, *abunamant*, the latter being described as 'international'.

This indebtedness to other languages does not, however, preclude the presence of a considerable corpus of native stock. Of particular interest are the long articles on such words as *abstall*, *acla*, illustrated by appropriate photographs and sketches. Different etymologies are proposed by the two editors to explain *abstall* and its many variants, which designate the structure used for the shoeing of oxen. C. Pult suggests that the German *Notstall* has become, by deglutination, *otstall*, whence *ostall*, *astall*; A. Schorta prefers a derivation from *Hospitale*m. In view of the widespread use of derivatives of *Stall* in Southern Italy and Sicily, as well as in the toponymy of the Pyrenees, it seems to us more probable that this form is the root of the Rheto-Romance variants. The term *acla*, meaning an outbuilding, or hut in the mountains, would appear to be a survival of the Latin *Accola*; the classical *Accola* is used only in the masculine, referring to a person, but, according to Ducange, it was also used in France in the feminine with the sense of 'small habitation'.

A further point brought out by the Dictionary is the difference in the speeches of the Catholic and Protestant inhabitants. The chief literature, frequently the only literature, of the Protestant household consists of the translations of the Bible and the Psalms, dating from the sixteenth century. This fact has exerted a strong conservative influence on the speech of the Protestants, as compared with that of their Catholic fellows.

We shall await with interest the forthcoming fascicules, as also the 'Rätisches Namenbuch', by Robert v. Planta and Andrea Schorta, appearing simultaneously with the Dictionary, to which it is complementary. The latter will form a useful basis of comparison with place-names in the Pyrenees and other mountainous regions within the Romance domain; a composite study of the toponymy of such areas would indeed be invaluable to the student of substrata.

W. D. ELCOCK.

An Analytical Grammar of the Hungarian Language. By ROBERT A. HALL, Jr. (*Linguistic Society of America, Language Monograph No. 18.*) Baltimore, Maryland. 1938. 113 pp.

The pioneer character of this grammar is evident from the circumstance that in his short bibliography Professor Hall does not include any English works on the subject. His justification lies in the fact that the grammars of such predecessors as J. Csink, I. Singer, C. A. Ginever and R. Honti are either antiquated or lack scientific precision. Hence the author had to derive the material for his systematization partly from his own practical command of the language and partly from the works of the Hungarian scholars Simonyi, Szinnyei and Várady.

In the general arrangement of his material, Professor Hall follows his authorities closely enough; the originality of his approach is best seen in his treatment of the auxiliary vowel. While Szinnyei's standard grammar posited different stems for the oblique cases of most nouns (*fold*, *foldé-d*, *foldo-n*, *doldu-nk*, etc.), Professor Hall explains the same phenomenon as a variation of the auxiliary vowel. This standpoint, fully legitimate in a purely descriptive grammar, enables him to formulate a uniform system for the possessive declension of nouns; the difference between the declension of stems ending in consonants and vowels (*hajó-i-m*, *ház-a-i-m*, *könyv-e-i-m*, *kalap-ja-i-m*, *kert-je-i-m*) disappears if one regards the *-a*, *-e*, *-ja*, *-je*, not as forms of the third person sing. possessive suffix, but as auxiliary vowels (pp. 32-3).

In the conjugation Professor Hall assigns an equally significant part to the auxiliary vowel; in fact, this is merely a corollary of his axiom that the tense or mood sign of the Hungarian verb is always consonantal (p. 49). One feels, however, that the vowel tends to lose its 'auxiliary' character if it is constantly followed by zero-ending (e.g. in eight forms out of eleven in the third person singular, cp. p. 58).

Professor Hall's classification of verbs is open to another, more serious, objection. He describes the *-lak*, *-lek* ending as the only 'incorporating' ending in Hungarian (pp. 11, 48, 57, etc.), since it expresses first person subject and second person object at the same time; he seems to be unaware of the fact that the so-called 'objective conjugation' comes under the same heading, as it performs exactly the same grammatical function with regard to an object in the third person and in the third person only; the definition of the 'objective conjugation' as expressing any 'sharply defined direct object of the action' (p. 49) is therefore incomplete. This confusion leads to misleading rules and incorrect examples (e.g. *mindnyájatokat szeretek*, p. 91).

The rest of the errors spring from an insufficient familiarity with the spoken language. There are no forms like *emlem*, *doblom* (from *emel-*, *dobol-*) in Hungarian and the rules for syncopating verbal stems ending in a liquid (p. 50) must be re-written. The chapter on Word-Formation is rich in incorrect examples, some of them recalling artificial formations from the heyday of the language reform (*segédetlen*, p. 74, *rejtékeny*, p. 75, *hajtalék* 'parabola', p. 73). Dialectal and archaic words like *fity*, *lyüki* (p. 18), *langos* (p. 41), fictitious verbal forms like *akarandalak*, *morgandok*

(p. 61) are out of place in a grammar which professes to restrict itself to the language of everyday life and of prose (p. 12). Nor is it sufficiently emphasized that the simple future, the perfect and the compound past tenses, which receive full treatment in the work, are never used in modern spoken Hungarian. A revision by a native would have cleared up these points and would have weeded out such sentences as the one on p. 93. *azt parancsolom, hogy ne resteljetelek*, 'I command that you be not lazy'.

In spite of these shortcomings, Professor Hall's book is a valuable contribution to the subject. It is based on sane foundations and the comprehensiveness of its treatment may be tested by the author's analysis of specimen texts in the appendix, where he gives constant references to paragraphs of the grammar. Notwithstanding minor inaccuracies, the work is a safe guide in the intricacies of the Hungarian language and has the merit of bringing many of its phenomena for the first time under the categories of English linguistic terminology.

N. J. SZENCZI.

LONDON.

Werden und Wesen der deutschen Sprache. Eine sprachgeschichtliche Einführung. By GEORGE NORDMEYER. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 1939. viii + 120 pp. \$2.25.

Dr Nordmeyer's main object would seem to be to make his subject interesting to beginners. In this he can claim to have succeeded: his presentation of linguistic material is simple and lucid. He very properly takes very little for granted, and allows the meaning of sound-laws to become gradually clear through well-chosen examples and a discussion of general principles. The method is original; it appears to be based on practical experience, and it may commend itself to students. An English translation would appeal to a wider circle of readers. But the book needs careful revision with regard to points of detail.

In the first place, there are some rather unfortunate misprints, e.g. p. 58 *alemannisch* not *alemmannisch*. On p. 77 the reading *Sinhtgunt* in the *Merseburger Zaubersprüche* is given as that of the manuscript and is repeated in the translation into modern German. In the latter it should be *Sinthgunt*, even if it is not treated as a scribal error in the manuscript. P. 84, line 3 *er* not *et*, line 4 *bewern* not *behern*. The symbols *b*, *d*, *z* are used on p. 12, but not explained till pp. 19-20. The Germanic equivalent of Indo-European *k* is given as *h*, but on p. 17 a footnote tells us that *h* developed 'zu dem gewöhnlichen *h*, einem stimmlosen Hauchlaut'. What then was the 'ungewöhnliches *h*'? The phonetic symbol of the voiceless guttural spirant is given on p. 25.

The minute distinctions between *urgermanisch*, *frühgermanisch*, *gemein-germanisch* and *germanisch* (p. 29) are too complicated for beginners.

To explain the nature of *Ablaut*, the pronunciation of initial *a* in the words *alternate* (we are not told whether the adjective or the verb is meant) and *alternative* is contrasted. This would convey nothing to British readers, who pronounce the initial *a* of both words in the same

way. In view of the high praise awarded to Brugmann's *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* on p. 99, it is rather surprising to find that on p. 43, in the paradigm of the hypothetical verb *kelbo* (I help), the 1st plur. pres. ind. is given as *kelb-o-men*. According to Dr Nordmeyer this is an Indo-European form, reconstructed 'aufgrund griechischer und altindischer Formen'. The Sanskrit ending would be *-mas* or *-masi*. It is true that Ionic Greek has *-men*, as in *φέρομεν*, but in Doric we find *-mes*, e.g. *φέρομες*. It is, therefore, difficult to see how we can reconstruct *-men* from Sanskrit and Greek. Moreover, what is the point of reconstructing Indo-European from these two sources alone? The origin of the *-men* forms in classical Greek is still unexplained: Professor Schwyzler states the evidence in his *Griechische Grammatik*. I, 662 (Iwan Müller, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*). This work is commended to Dr Nordmeyer's careful attention. In the bibliography at the end of the book under review various philological journals are enumerated. One regrets to observe the absence of the *Modern Language Review*, and one hopes that this defect will be remedied in the event of a second edition.

JAMES M. CLARK.

GLASGOW.

Hartmann von Aue. Von H. SPARNAAY. Zweiter Band. Halle: Niemeyer. 1938. iv + 149 pp. M. 7.

The second volume of this biography¹ deals with *Der arme Heinrich* (pp. 1-16), *Iwein* (pp. 17-57), 'Das Werk. Gehalt und Gestaltung' (pp. 58-88), 'Der Dichter' (pp. 89-106). There is an excellent bibliography (pp. 107-45) and an Index to the two volumes (pp. 146-9).

The volume opens with a discussion of the source of *Der arme Heinrich*. Sparnaay cannot agree that the *exemplum* found and published by Joseph Klapper can be the direct source. It is too short, and from what we know of Hartmann, he would not have lengthened 68 lines of prose into 1500 lines of verse. Nor can the author agree with von Kraus who has argued lately that the *exemplum* is derived from *Der arme Heinrich*. For if that were so, it would be difficult to account for the way in which the *exemplum* both omits and distorts moral reflexions. Since, however, *exemplum* and *Der arme Heinrich* are clearly connected, Sparnaay adopts the usual way out and takes them both back to a lost source. To account for the bareness of the *exemplum* and the length of *Der arme Heinrich*, a further Latin link is postulated between the archetype and the German poem. We thus obtain an archetype from which both the *exemplum* and a more developed Latin work are derived, and the latter would be the direct source of *Der arme Heinrich*. It is a neat construction, and the case is well argued. Yet the theory is by no means proven, for the two preserved works are in many points so dissimilar that certainty must remain impossible. The only real factual alteration that Hartmann made in his German adaptation was to connect up the story with an event,

¹ For a review of the first volume, cf. *Mod. Lang. Rev.* XXXI, 457-8.

real or imaginary, that occurred in the family of his hege-lord. Sparnaay rightly stresses that such a conclusion in no way detracts from the poetic merit and originality of *Der arme Heinrich*.

Some further hints for the methods of obtaining the source could be gathered from the introductory lines. When Hartmann tells us that a knight was so learned that he could read what is written in books, there is not a shadow of doubt that he is referring to Latin works. Again and again he studied all sorts of books (*er nam in mänge schouwe an mislichen buochen*). It is unlikely that his lord and master possessed a library of the size indicated. Hartmann must have carried on his 'Quellenstudium' at a near-by monastic library. St Gall and Reichenau suggest themselves, and the latter is more likely. From the very outset he was determined to write a pious story, and this deliberateness can be used biographically. There is nothing new in postulating a change of heart in Hartmann, but it is usually overlooked that that change of heart, and much besides, can be proved from the introductory lines of *Der arme Heinrich*.

In the chapter on *Iwein*, Sparnaay employs the synthetic method made famous by Hermann Schneider. After a few sentences on the 'historical' *Iwein* we come to Stage A, composed in Anglo-Norman by a bilingual Breton round about 1125 in South Wales. The content of this story corresponds more or less to that already deduced by Brown in 1903.¹ Stage B is also composed in Anglo-Norman, and Sparnaay assumes that in this version there first appears a close connexion with the Arthurian court. Stage C is represented by Chrétien's *Yvain* and the Welsh *Owain and Lunet*. All this is of less interest to the student of Hartmann than to the Arthurian expert; the latter will find a clear and useful summary of theory and counter-theory, but nothing very new. The twelve pages devoted to interpretative criticism of Hartmann's *Iwein* bring out the well-known characteristics of Hartmann's style: his 'homeliness', his honest and lovable desire to instruct and uplift, his perfect control of form and content. It has long been realized that in *Iwein* Hartmann follows Chrétien's *Yvain* as closely as possible. Deviations from the original are invariably deliberate, and arise from the German poet's differing moral, ethical and educational outlook. The issues are relatively simple, and the ground has been exhaustively covered so that we cannot quarrel with Sparnaay if he merely recapitulates what has long been established.

The last two chapters of the book summarize Hartmann's achievement, and there is much repetition, under a more general aspect, of features that have already been discussed when dealing with the individual works. The author deals, among other things, with the problems raised by the chronology of Hartmann's work. There is little doubt that the Arthurian *Erec* is followed by the more pious *Gregorius*, the very pious *Der arme Heinrich*, and the very worldly Arthurian *Iwein*. By stressing the worldly features in *Gregorius*, and by arguing that *Iwein* is an 'Entwicklungsroman' which is built upon a pattern of guilt and subsequent expiation, Sparnaay attempts to explain Hartmann's artistic and ethical develop-

¹ A. C. L. Brown, *Iwain, a Study in the Origin of Arthurian Romance* (*Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, 8).

ment. Things can be over-simplified, and it would be better to admit that the spiritual development of Hartmann presents a problem which we are unable to solve as long as we insist on postulating a logical development. Human beings do not necessarily conform to such logical patterns, and since consistency is not to be expected in every human being, why should we insist on it in Hartmann? There has been far too much discussion of this so-called 'problem', and as there is no possibility of solving it satisfactorily from the internal evidence of the works, we had better leave it.

A work such as this inevitably prompts comparison with the earlier attempt to write a biography of Hartmann by F. Piquet whose *Étude sur Hartmann d'Aue*, originally published in 1898, was reprinted unaltered in 1928. Hartmann-scholarship only really began in earnest after the publication of Piquet's brilliant thesis, and it says much for Piquet's thorough and careful analysis that, whilst innumerable details have been corrected by later investigators, the essential picture of Hartmann remains the same. In one important respect, Piquet stands head and shoulders above his successor. Piquet wrote in French, and being a Frenchman, it goes almost without saying that he wrote well. Sparnaay, the Dutch scholar, has elected to write in German, and he frequently writes it very badly. A few examples: 'Dem Mädchen erwartet als Belohnung seiner *caritas* die ewige Seligkeit' (p. 11). 'H.s Kunst gilt vor allem die Sprache, den Stil, die innere Form' (p. 15), 'denn auch an Hartmann erfüllt sich das Wort, dass nur in der Form zeigt sich der Geist' (p. 106, last sentence in the book!) There are many more such examples and most of them cannot be misprints.

F. NORMAN.

LONDON.

Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung. System und Methodenlehre der Literaturwissenschaft. By JULIUS PETERSEN. I. Band. *Werk und Dichter*. Berlin: Junker und Dunnhaupt. 1939. xvi+516 pp. M.16.

The young Germanist who looks into the new edition of Goedeke's *Grundriss* with its hundreds of thousands of entries (including ephemeral newspaper articles) may well be pardoned if he recoils with horror and despair from a discipline which at first sight had promised to be a 'froliche Wissenschaft'. For there is no doubt that the scientific thoroughness with which literature has been studied (especially in Germany) has threatened to put out the divine spark with the weight of academic litter. This is of course no new reproach, nor is it confined to this country: 'das schwierigste am Sammeln', wrote Albert Koster, 'ist das Wegwerfen.' Librarians all the world over complain of the impossibility of keeping pace with the vast output of books; 20,000 come out each year in Germany alone!

This is not to deny value to criticism as an ancillary to literary appreciation; but in the academic sphere it is too often an end in itself. The scholar will be grateful to Professor Petersen for the skill and discern-

ment with which he guides him through the maze of literary theory which has undergone so remarkable a revival since the Great War, and nowhere more than in Germany. Professor Petersen himself helped to inaugurate the new discipline when he delivered his inaugural lecture at Basle in 1913 on 'Literaturgeschichte als Wissenschaft', he followed its development in that most useful survey, *Die Wesensbestimmung der deutschen Romantik* (1926), and now he has gathered together all its threads in the present encyclopaedic volume. He has again proved his competence to steer a true course between the rival schools: philological, philosophical, psychological, aesthetic, metaphysical, ideological, and the rest. He succeeds most admirably in preserving his balance and his judgement, only very occasionally indulging in some sally inspired by the Nazi outlook on literature. His knowledge is amazing and his industry unsparing, as the fifty-six closely printed pages of notes testify. But a work of such dimensions (it is planned to comprise three volumes) will require an index if it is to do justice to its immense learning.

L. A. WILLOUGHBY.

LONDON.

Lessing's Dramatic Theory. Being an Introduction to and Commentary on his 'Hamburgische Dramaturgie'. By J. G. ROBERTSON. Cambridge: University Press. 1939. x+544 pp. 30s.

Several critics have, in recent years, questioned Lessing's intellectual integrity. They have not succeeded in revising the estimate, hitherto accepted, of Lessing's sincerity and it will not be necessary to discuss their views in an account of a book which deals only with his dramatic criticism, and in which the author, while he is not uncritical himself, takes little note of the more extreme views of Lessing's newer critics, and finally comes to the conclusion that the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* is 'without question the greatest treatise on the theory of drama' which the eighteenth century produced.

The late Professor J. G. Robertson began to publish the results of his investigations into the sources of Lessing's dramatic theory in the *Modern Language Review* more than twenty years ago. Until his death in 1933 he was largely engaged in these researches and the present volume, embracing virtually the whole of Lessing's theory in all its manifold aspects, had progressed so far towards completion that Professor Edna Purdie has been able to publish the manuscript practically as it stood. The amount of preparatory work, however, which she had to do was enormous. She has traced all the materials to their source and verified all references and quotations (a feature of the book) and compiled indexes which will prove invaluable for all students of Lessing's major critical work and his other writings on the drama.

The book is divided into three parts. Part I (pp. 1-132) deals mainly with the organization, staff and repertory of the Hamburg National Theatre and Lessing's association with it. Much useful information that is not easily found elsewhere is given in this section and without it a

great deal that we read in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* must remain obscure. We are given an explanation of the conditions under which the 'national' theatre came into being, its aims and methods and the reason for its ultimate failure. There is a restrained and appreciative account of the actors and actresses and a resumé, together with useful synopses, of the theatrical history of the plays that were performed.

While this section will be of considerable interest to students of the sociological basis of literary and theatrical developments, the second part of the book (pp. 133-332) will appeal to those who are more interested in literary criticism (in the narrower sense). It deals with Lessing's views on the merits and defects of the individual German and French plays performed at Hamburg in his time and, since no other plays were actually presented on the stage, his views on the drama generally of England, Spain, Greece and Rome. Robertson discusses mainly the sources of Lessing's knowledge and the 'grounds on which his own judgments are based'. He has been able to show how extensively Lessing relied for his opinion on the writings e.g. of Lérís, Parfaict, Voltaire, Mendelssohn. He gives the originals of Lessing's quotations and of the scenes translated by him as they appear in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (cf. pp. 198, 268, 277), considers his criticism of Cronegk and Weisse, and demonstrates the disappointing slightness of his remarks on Shakespeare and the English dramatists generally. He sums up his opinion as follows (p. 244): 'In the end, Lessing was more interested in questions of theory, in the technique of dramatic art, in the relations of different versions of the same theme, in translations and adaptations, than in the concrete question of the intrinsic values of individual plays'—a good statement of the main difference between German and English dramatic criticism, which should be remembered by students of the subject.

The third section of the book (pp. 333-488) then deals with Lessing's theory of the drama. In substance the articles published in the *Modern Language Review* (vols. XI and XIII) concerning the plot, emotions and purpose of tragedy are here reproduced, but there are also important additions dealing with types of tragedy, comedy, character, the supernatural, illusion, genius and good taste, form and technique, the art of the actor and music in the theatre. It will be seen how systematic and complete is this treatment of Lessing's dramatic theory. His views are fully stated on all except a few of the major points of interest, and it is impossible to give more than a summary of Robertson's conclusions.

It was his main purpose to show that the chief elements of Lessing's theory, those in particular which have attracted the greatest attention, are, strictly speaking, not of Lessing's own finding, but go back to, or have their counterpart in, the views of such men as d'Aubignac, Batteux, Corneille, Louis Racine, Du Bos, Voltaire, Home, Diderot ('the greatest force in the ultimate crystallization of his ideas on the nature, function and presentation of the drama', p. 341), J. E. Schlegel, Curtius, Mendelssohn ('I doubt whether even yet the full extent of his debt to Mendelssohn has been recognized', p. 337). Lessing is thus seen as a critic who 'approached his problems in an eclectic way, not as an original

thinker His industrious reading brought him face to face with a considerable body of literature on the nature and function of dramatic poetry, and he made it his business to pick and choose what was congenial to him' (p. 334). Robertson further stresses the fact that Lessing 'arrived at no new discovery and stated no conclusion in his Aristotelian criticism that was new or unknown in his day, and where he did attempt to initiate new interpretations of the Aristotelian text, these have proved, almost without exception, unacceptable to later scholarship' (p. 349). He also denies any real development in Lessing's theory between the years 1757 and 1769, dismissing the *Laokoon* as unimportant for the dramatic theory, and recognizing no advance in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* over the correspondence with Mendelssohn (pp. 334, 340, 342), and he therefore doubts whether Lessing's philosophical studies affected his dramatic theory.

The value of Robertson's researches into the sources and possible sources of Lessing's theories will not be questioned; without a knowledge of them any estimate of Lessing's critical work must remain one-sided and dangerously subjective. But it would be equally unsound to assess it solely according to the principles applied by Robertson. Frequently Lessing's indebtedness is a matter of conjecture, and the passages which Robertson quotes are not always convincing evidence. There are essential differences e.g. between Lessing's conceptions of catharsis and genius and those of Batteux and Sulzer respectively (cf. pp. 375, 454). We can go further. The intrinsic worth of a critical work, especially in the cosmopolitan era to which Lessing belonged, is not entirely identical with its absolute originality. Robertson has little to say of the indebtedness of those to whom Lessing was indebted, and perhaps he underestimates the value of that intellectual exchange by which the European tradition has been built up and in which the individual achievement is not the only important criterion. It is true that Lessing's contributions to the interpretation of Aristotle's *Poetics* have not all found favour with modern scholars. But far from hampering scholarship, his mistakes, which are always ingenious conjectures, have advanced it, because he had an unerring sense of the essentials in any given problem. His work is freer of laboured and irrelevant argumentation than that of many of his contemporaries.

I cannot agree with Robertson's opinions that Lessing has given no original interpretation of the Aristotelian text and that his theory as stated in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* shows no development of his ideas. Lessing's originality consisted in his ability to select and combine, a process in which a novel whole was constituted. Thus the analysis and correlation of the tragic emotions in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* is not simply derived from Mendelssohn or Brumoy or any other source. It is here, as well as in his thoughts concerning the relation between history and drama, that the development of his ideas can be recognized. His preoccupation with the problem of *Laokoon* had, among other things, considerably deepened his appreciation of Greek tragedy as a manifestation of the Hellenic spirit, a point of view which was his main argument

against Winckelmann and Mendelssohn and colours everything he has to say in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* on the nature and purpose of tragedy. It is also not difficult to discover the influence of his very important and valuable philosophical studies on his dramatic theory. If one appreciates what he says on the subjects of Providence and Free Will, and considers his ideals of human life and conduct. He is, fortunately, not a metaphysician among critics. But as a philosopher he commands much more respect than any of the critics to whom he may have been indebted.

It is only in the Conclusion that Robertson takes the opportunity to assess Lessing's work at its true value. As Professor Purdie points out, this is a first draft and it stood in need of much greater elaboration. And though the praise is generous and as enthusiastic as careful scholarship will allow, we must regret that it has been relegated to the final summing up and is so little connected with the main body of this important, compendious and authoritative work.

E. L. STAHL.

OXFORD.

Der Streit um 'Faust II' seit 1900. Chronologisch und nach Sachpunkten geordnet. Mit kommentierter Bibliographie von 512 Titeln. By ADA M. KLETT. (*Jenaer Germanistische Forschungen*, 33.) Jena: Frommann. 1939. 216 pp. M. 6.80.

This is another of those compendious works, with which we are becoming familiar, in which American scholars take upon themselves the onerous task of assembling for our benefit a mass of material not hitherto available in convenient form. The present book falls into three main parts: (1) a chronological survey since 1900; (2) a similar survey 'nach sachlichen Gesichtspunkten geordnet'; (3) a bibliography.

The first part, after a very brief review of the time before 1900, deals with the German and the most important foreign 'interpretative Faust-literatur' of the years 1900-38. The limitation implied by that definition is best given in the author's own words.

Ausgeschlossen wurden Schriften, die den 'Faust' entweder historisch, d.h. als Fortentwicklung des überlieferten Fauststoffes, oder genetisch, d.h. nach Ursprung, Quellen, Parallelen, Paralipomena, oder biographisch, d.h. auf Goethe bezogen, oder bühnengeschichtlich betrachten; berücksichtigt wurden lediglich Studien zur künstlerischen Form des Werkes und Deutungen nach seinem ethisch-philosophischen Ideengehalt.

This short survey of 25 pages is followed by the 'Hauptteil' of the work (pp. 26-152), which is itself subdivided into (a) 'Teilfragen', in the order of their appearance. 'die Alpenweltszene', 'Kaiserhofszenen', 'Fausts Gang zu den Müttern', etc.; (b) 'Fragen, die die Dichtung als Ganzes betreffen'. This 'second and more important half', as the author calls it, contains five sections, of which the last, 'Einschätzung', is perhaps the most interesting part of the book. In this evaluation she gathers together threads from the preceding chapters, quotes the leading critics pro and contra, and attempts to estimate the message of *Faust II*

for the world of to-day. She points to the ever-increasing volume of testimony in Germany to the greatness of that Part since those dark days when Friedrich Theodor Vischer (as Deutobold Symbolizetti Allegoriotwitsch Mystifizinski) wrote his notorious Third Part, and laments that 'das böse Wort des hochverdienten Mannes den Zugang zu einer verständnisvollen Würdigung des Zweiten Teils auf Jahrzehnte hinaus erschwert hat'.

Here as in other parts English critics receive full consideration. Barker Fairley, in particular, is quoted at great length, and later in the Bibliography is given a critic's description of him as 'Hohepunkt der englischen Goetheliteratur'. But on the whole she inclines to suggest that English and other foreign critics of *Faust II* are old-fashioned, and have not arrived at the stage of appreciation of the latest German writers—that among other things they are obsessed with the First Part, and persist in judging the Second Part by its standards. For the general body of those in England who are interested in German literature, without being special students of it, this is probably on the whole true.

Finally we have the Bibliography, with the author's own comments on many of the works quoted. This is to be regarded as a 'wichtiger Bestandteil der Arbeit', and is her chief direct personal contribution, since in the rest of the book she has endeavoured to be as objective as possible, and has quoted her critics in their own words. She aims in it at completeness for German critics of *Faust II* since 1900, while giving the principal English, American and French works, and some of those from other lands. It is a valuable addition to what is altogether a very useful work.

H. G. ATKINS.

LONDON.

SHORT NOTICES

The first part of Professor Walter Schirmer's work (to appear in some ten parts) *Geschichte der englischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Halle: Niemeyer. 1937. 1. Lieferung. 80 pp. RM. 2) makes an excellent beginning. The first section, dealing with Old English literature, is comprehensive and clear, particularly the passages on prose, while the remainder, on the early Middle Ages, is of special note in its terse accounts of philosophers and historians.

No list of references is yet given, but the poetical quotations in the first section are from Grein—not always a satisfactory source. There are a few misprints, none of great note.

ANGUS MACDONALD.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

Dr Helmut Ehmer's *Die sächsischen Siedlungen auf dem französischen 'Litus Saxonicum'* (*Studien zur englischen Philologie*, Band xcii. Halle: Niemeyer. 1937. 58 pp. RM. 2.80), the first product of the Department of Northern Archaeology in the English Seminar at Gottingen, is a

competent if uninspired piece of work. As its title might imply, it is an attempt of a not unfamiliar kind to combine linguistic and archaeological research in treating, from a non-specialist standpoint, the Saxon settlements in the north of France, and attempting to decide on their date and origin. The thirty-six *-ington* names dealt with occur in a compact cluster near Boulogne (Dept. Pas-de-Calais), and the author's conclusions are that they are the result of a secondary settlement from England—probably from Kent—and are not earlier than the second half of the sixth century.

The primary authorities—the *Notitia Dignitatum*, Eutropius, Amianus Marcellinus, Sidonius Apollinaris, and Gregory of Tours—are all examined for evidence, and the main place-name works are carefully used; indeed, the bibliography is useful and quite comprehensive, though several items in it have since been superseded, and Marcus's list in *Der gegenwärtige Stand der englischen Ortsnamenforschung in Archiv* was decidedly incomplete when published. Some of the origins, too, seem a little dubious.

ANGUS MACDONALD.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

The appearance of the fourth and definitive edition of Professor Wilhelm Franz's *Shakespeare-Grammatik* may be regarded as the event of the year in Shakespearean scholarship. Nearly half a century ago his first contributions to Elizabethan syntax were published in *Englische Studien*, anticipating the fuller study of Shakespeare's language printed in 1898 which, though containing little that was new, soon won recognition as a reliable work of reference. Further editions followed at almost regular intervals: in 1909, in 1924 and now in 1939. In each of these Franz has spared no pains to record, as concisely and as lucidly as possible, every new contribution to knowledge in this field. The present volume has been considerably revised throughout and in part rearranged, but, for reference purposes, the numbering of the paragraphs has been strictly retained. The book bears the more comprehensive title: *Die Sprache Shakespeares in Vers und Prosa unter Berücksichtigung des Amerikanischen entwicklungsgeschichtlich dargestellt: Shakespeare-Grammatik in 4. Auflage überarbeitet und wesentlich erweitert* (Halle: Niemeyer. 1939. xl+730 pp. RM. 26). In the extended Introduction, Shakespeare's language is yet more fully considered on its historical background and researches in American English by Craigie, Mencken, Spies and others have enabled Franz to devote more attention to the survival of Shakespearean idiom on the other side of the Atlantic. Acquaintance with textual studies by Sir Edmund Chambers and Professor Dover Wilson is apparent. Greater completeness is given to the book by the addition of a Second Part (§§ 712-65) on *Metrik und Rhythmik* which is largely a reprint, with important modifications, of Franz's well-known treatise, printed separately in 1932, on *Shakespeares Blankvers mit Nachträgen zu des Verfassers Shakespeare-Grammatik (in dritter Auflage)*. The author of this standard work, now in his eighty-first year, is to be heartily con-

gratulated upon this crowning achievement in a life of unselfish devotion to learning.

SIMEON POTTER.

SOUTHAMPTON.

'Private honour is the foundation of public trust', declared Burke. Nevertheless, his financial affairs have worried biographers from the first, because of the obscurity surrounding his dealings with the East India Company, his purchase of property too expensive for his purse, and his highly questionable appointments when he was Paymaster-General. In *Edmund Burke and his Kinsmen: A Study of the Statesman's Financial Integrity and Private Relationships* (University of Colorado Studies in the Humanities, vol. i, No. 1 1939. 114 pp. \$1.00) Professor Dixon Wecter subjects these and other matters to an intensive examination, traces Burke's life through the hitherto vague years from 1750-1759, throws new light on the growth of his admiration for the aristocratic tradition, and provides detailed biographies of his brother Richard and his kinsman William, both deeply involved in the affairs of the trusting Edmund and both tarred with the common peculations of the age. Burke was incapable of attending to business affairs and left them to others; he idealized the motives of his friends and vilified the aspersions of their enemies to such an extent as to lay himself open to suspicion, but Professor Wecter's evidence practically exonerates him, except from the charge of misplaced and impractical confidence in the unworthy. Future biographers will hardly need to go further for information on this side of Burke's life than this tenaciously minute, factual, and exhaustive study.

A. R. HUMPHREYS.

LIVERPOOL.

Walt Taylor's monograph on *Doughty's English* (S.P.E. Tract No. LI. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1939. 46 pp. 3s 6d.) is a distinguished piece of work which admirably fulfils its purpose. Doughty has been fortunate in his commentators. D. G. Hogarth's biography, Barker Fairley's critical study and Anne Treneer's appreciation are excellent, and all three books contain informative chapters on Doughty's achievement as a master of language. The present treatise is devoted exclusively to linguistic analysis and it is both critical and selective. Its deductions are based upon a thorough examination of all the published works and of the manuscript thesaurus of words and phrases recently presented by Mrs Doughty to the University of Cambridge. Doughty's style was 'at once modern, Chaucerian, Elizabethan, and Arabic'. He believed that he could make new channels for English direct from the upper reaches. He believed that a primitive or 'elemental' language like Arabic was less abstract and more emotive than an advanced and outworn language like Victorian English which had become sophisticated and lifeless. Therefore he loved the 'perspicuous propriety' of good Arabic and he praised 'that round kind of utterance of the Arab coffee-drinkers, with election of

words, and dropping (*sic*) with the sap of a human life' Taylor's account of Doughty's linguistic performance is both penetrating and just 'I think we shall find that he preferred a word the sense of which could be referred to that of its root; that he preferred the Germanic to the Latin word and the looser Germanic syntax to the more formal Latin syntax of English; that he liked words which had gathered round them emotional associations. Above all, his English is elemental in that he exalted the power of the individual word. His thought was conceived and expressed not as the paragraph in prose and the stanza in verse, nor as the sentence which is a unit in itself, but as a sequence of carefully chosen and placed but separate words' (pp. 10-11). One is surprised to find *blood-stone* (p. 16) in the list of compound substantives invented by Doughty: the word was certainly current in the same sense among the Elizabethans. *Woman-kind* (p. 19) is not necessarily Spenserian: it was used by Trevisa and by the author of 'Cursor Mundi'. It would have been of interest to record that *smell-feast* (p. 31), 'one who comes attracted by the smell of food', was a form that caught Doughty's eye when perusing Sir Thomas Elyot's Latin-English dictionary in the Bodleian. *Along of* (p. 33), in the sense of 'because of', 'owing to', and *to let fly* (*ibid.*) cannot be dismissed as mere colloquialisms: their antecedents were doubtless encountered by Doughty in his extensive readings in Old English poetry and prose.

SOUTHAMPTON.

SIMEON POTTER.

Mr Louis MacNeice's *Modern Poetry. A Personal Essay* (London: Oxford University Press, 1938, 205 pp., 7s 6d.) makes a contribution to the understanding and criticism of its subject which is valuable as coming from one of the best modern poets. The author has plenty of bright impressions, likes and dislikes to record—that rather than any thorough system to expound—and on the subject of his own technique and that (in particular) of Auden, he writes with authority. There is less evidence of authority when he turns his attention to past English poetry: he uses scraps of it to illustrate theories apparently derived from scraps of it rather than lets large amounts of it have their own say. Nor are the chapters on his personal history (at home, at school, at the university) strictly necessary, since Mr MacNeice, who is often an autobiographical poet, has already given us the gist of the information in his verse. Mr MacNeice, however, has succeeded in what was probably his aim: to make the general reader feel rather more at home in the best poetry published during the last ten years.

LONDON.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

A number of Hr. Emanuel Walberg's Scandinavian pupils and friends have presented to him a volume of *Mélanges de Linguistique et de Littérature* (Uppsala: A. B. Lundequist, 1938, 346 pp.) on the occasion of his sixth-fifth birthday. This *Review* adds its felicitations. The articles cover French and English philology, with one or two excursions elsewhere,

and are distinguished for the care with which, in almost every case, the previous work on the point at issue has been discussed. M. Behre explains the Med. Eng. *rochine* as Fr. *roche* -*in(e)*, a suffix occurring in other words denoting the concept 'wilderness', e.g. *gastine*. E. Ekwall has a full semasiological discussion of Eng. *fond*, which he connects with O.N. *fúnn*, Swed. *foen fogen fogna* 'rotten'. The root-form in English is *fonn*-, whence the verb *fonne*, postverbal *fanned*. H. Kokeritz discusses Gill's notes on southern and eastern dialects in 1621, and explains *che vor yi* as 'I warrant you'. A. Kihlbom explains the use of the present subjunctive in conditional clauses as volitional-meditative in Old English. A. H. King's note connects literature and language by discussing a triangle of echoes between Marston, Chapman and Ben Jonson. Writing on the only German subject, N. Tornqvist proposes *ze æhte her* as the etymon of *zêter*. This accounts for one-third of the miscellany; the rest is Romanic. E. Lofstedt discusses Latin *idem est dicere, sic* in a sense like It. *così*, and *venire* with past participle. The etymological studies include P. Falk's explanation of *l'échapper belle* as based on *la faillir* (*manquer*) *belle* and derived from the *jeu de paume*, K. Sandfeld's Provençal derivation for O.Fr. *los*, M. Sahlén's proposal of the derivation LECTIA *laisse*, with the further suggestion that the performance of poems in *laisses* was modelled on the reading of lessons from saints' lives, A. Sjogren's derivation of *Garule* from GALLIA, not directly (which would give *La Jaille*, as in place-names), but by Wace, who found several Norman hamlets called *La Gaule*, but latinized as *Gallia*. A. Lombard discusses the pan-Romanic formation of indefinite pronouns or adverbs by means of a relative verb, and J. Vising collects examples of apparent equivalence between simple and anterior past tenses. *Ço nus estoet* (*Rol* 3630) is explained by K. E. Lindgren as containing an accusative in the *ço*; J. Melander gives c. 1250 for the change from *le me* to *me le*; and K. Ringenson has a semantic note on *la veille* (which has passed from a religious sense to a lay one, and thence to the figurative), paying special attention to the dates of changes. A. C. Thorn notes that the *Rue aux Oyers* has passed to *Rue aux Ours* in Paris, and adds a curious observation about the underlying social change which eliminated the *oyers* from among tradesmen. B. Hasselrot explains Franco-Prov. *nostron* as (a) due to *mon*, (b) favoured by the persistence of -o as vowel of support. The form is encountered in almost the whole Franco-Provençal area, and the writer has been led to define the boundaries of this region. His criterion is that Franco-Provençal is the region in which final atonic -a becomes *i* (æ *e*) after a palatal, but otherwise remains -a. A. Långfors edits the text of a fourteenth-century parlour-game, and C. Fahlin criticizes Dr Arnold's edition of Wace's *Brut* for unnecessary deviations from MS. P., though generally he has the highest praise for the edition. E. Bendz's 'Souvenirs d'Istrati' comes unexpectedly in this severely erudite context, and C. A. Westerblad strays into Italian literature. He defends Pellico from the charge of delation, and suggests that reminiscences of his trial can be found in various works.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

It is a pleasure to meet so enthusiastic and so scholarly an admirer of Pindar as Mr Isidore Silver, who in *The Pindaric Odes of Ronsard* (Paris, 1937. xv+143 pp.) has made a careful analysis of Ronsard's relations to his model. He says with truth that there has been no thorough study of Ronsard's debt to Pindar with respect to imagery, and no examination of his borrowings. But might not M. Paul Laumonier and other Ronsardists say that, while Mr Silver's admirable work is of great interest, it does not essentially concern the question of Pindar's influence on Ronsard's poetry in general? For it is his non-Pindaric poetry that has derived the greatest benefit from that influence. That the Pindaric odes are on the whole a failure is generally agreed. The failure was inevitable. For, as Mr Silver recognizes, the conditions under which Pindar, a great national and religious poet, wrote were wholly alien to his follower's age and country. Does not Mr Silver weigh down the scales a little unfairly against Ronsard? His imitation of the beautiful opening of the seventh Olympic ode is certainly a happy one, even if it does not bring out the full effect of the original. His work should be judged, not as a rendering of Pindar, but as French poetry. In the great Ode to Michel de l'Hospital there are passages of considerable beauty, for instance, in Jupiter's exposition of that theory of *fureur poétique* which Ronsard derived, not from Pindar, but from Plato, especially in the description of Oceanus's palace under the sea and in Calliope's prayer.

A. TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

The reader who is faced with 601 *rondeaux* may well turn to the introduction for lighter reading, but in the case of M. Marcel Françon's *Poèmes de Transition: Rondeaux du MS. 402 de Lille* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; Paris: Droz. 771 pp. in 2 vols.) his eye may rest with astonishment on the preface. M. Henry Guy commends M. Françon's book by expressing his own dislike of *rondeaux* and his doubts whether there is anything to be expected from them. Nevertheless, 'l'historien de la littérature n'a pas le droit, en effet, de ne considérer les choses que du point de vue de l'esthétique. Sa mission consiste à rendre compte de l'évolution des genres et à étudier, en les traitant comme un phénomène continu, le flux et reflux des doctrines et des modes.' Doubtful doctrine! For surely he differs from the other historians precisely because his material is selected for him by aesthetic considerations, and he is not bound to subscribe in advance to a theory of *Stromungen*, but only to say how things aesthetically worth while actually came into being. M. Françon sees the main interest of his collection in 'les traits de la société qui nous est peinte dans notre *album*'. He makes ingenious correlations between this and the other arts, to support the thesis: 'Tout est sur le point de se transformer; la société moderne, celle qui est en train aujourd'hui de mourir, naît au moment que nous avons étudié.' The Lille manuscript falls in a period of decadence, suffering from a 'vide intérieur de sa civilisation', in which were germinating the new

themes of religious and social struggles. This is well and ingeniously done. Curiously enough, the nearest of the arts—the one necessary that there should be *rondeaux*—is most distantly treated. There is no music in the Lille manuscript, but a good deal is known of the music of *rondeaux* which would lead to a closer correlation than that which is made. Strictly speaking, is it possible to examine melic poetry only 'du point de vue littéraire'? However, from this point of view both critics note the hardihood of many pieces. There were strange things said in the salons of François I'. Among the rest there is a great deal that is conventional. People put into *rondeaux* the conceits they put into sonnets half a century later; and, as with sonnets, one must expect to wade through deep boredom to encounter something that echoes in the mind. Yet there are such things even in the Lille manuscript, unless I am mistaken, neatly formal, not necessarily void of emotion though conventional, and with a happy turn of expression which the French language was soon to forfeit. An Elizabethan sonneteer would not have been ashamed to write in his style:

La plus parfaite des œuvres de nature,
le paragon de toute aultre facture,
l'excellence sur toutes femmes,
la plus douce de toutes les benignes,
la toute bonne sans mal ne forfaiture,
celle ou noblesse a donné geniture,
en qui tous biens prennent leur nourriture,
par ces vertus hautes et celestines,
la plus parfaite;
de bonnes meurs a fait sa fourniture,
de los et pris tresample garniture,
plus que humaines ses graces sont divines;
en fais, en dis, en gestes et en mines
c'est l'accomplie, sur toute creature
la plus parfaite. (CCXLV).

Andrew Lang would have savoured that morsel. Is it possible that French critical habits are too standardized to take their pleasure where they find it?

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Max Sorkin's doctoral dissertation on *Paul Scarron's Adaptations of the Comedia* (New York. 1938. viii + 115 pp.) concerns eight plays whose sources have long been known. Even after Carrington Lancaster's work, to which Mr Sorkin is principally indebted, an exhaustive study based on a conscientious examination of the texts would have been welcome. We are given instead a hundred pages of superficial and rather confusing quotations and remarks, which do not even utilize properly, let alone replace, the German monographs on three of the plays. On one hand, Mr Sorkin fails to give anything like complete lists of the numerous witticisms, for example, or of the obscenities added by Scarron, or of the cases where the text represents a purely verbal enlargement of the Spanish; on the other hand he repeatedly quotes, as if they were invented

by Scarron (cp. p. 12, *Lacrymule, Béatricule*; p. 15, *Allez vous en filer*; p. 34, *A simple concubine*), details certainly derived from the Spanish texts, which are insufficiently referred to, and for which Mr Sorkin has little sympathy. His keenness for 'characterization' leads him into pitfalls: a servant is 'resourceful' because she hides a lover (p. 12)· Fernand, in *Jodelet*, is 'absent-minded' because he praises Mairret (p. 16)! Similarly his allusions to Scarron's 'realism' (pp. 17, 23, 60, 80—cp. also statements to the opposite effect, p. 42 n. 22, p. 43, p. 96) are often not only debatable in themselves, but imply no realization of the problems involved in Scarron's aesthetics. Why say that Fernand (p. 16) or Blaize (p. 94) are 'less conventional' than their models, when the whole point is that they are *burlesque creations*? Mr Sorkin fails to appreciate the subtle irony of passages such as Isabelle's soliloquy in *Jodelet* (cp. p. 21), and he is probably wrong in attributing to Scarron any great regard for the conventions and dramatic illusion. With this fundamental proviso, we can accept his conclusions, that Scarron partly improves the structure of the plays, that he is 'more comic' than his models, and that he eliminates 'artificial rhetoric', if we understand by this term, as Mr Sorkin does, some of the most graceful poetry in literature. To us this last point offers in itself no motive for jubilation, any more than it did to Martinenche, who is incidentally the object of a quite gratuitous attack here, for saying that Scarron 'slavishly imitated' the Spanish theatre: Scarron after all does imitate considerably, and the information supplied here on his method of imitation is not exactly objective or scientific.

G. HAINSWORTH.

LEEDS.

Herr Walter Müller's *Die Grundbegriffe der gesellschaftlichen Welt in den Werken des Abbé Prévost* (*Marburger Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie*, Heft XIX. Marburg: Hans Michaelis-Braun. 1938. vi+100 pp. No price given) attempts a study of the writings of Prévost from a new angle. Instead of considering him as a *préromantique*, he shows how his works reflect, as does so much of French literature from the seventeenth century onwards, the development in France from a feudal economy towards new social forms, and the increasing influence of money on human relationships. Despite a rather uncritical accumulation of every mention of money in the works of Prévost, and a fondness for abstract expressions (why speak, for instance, of 'die abstrakte Geldkategorie'?), the first section of the book is interesting. The second section, which deals with the influence of social forces on the general outlook of Prévost, is extremely confused owing to this fondness for abstract terms. Nevertheless, the author disposes very effectively of the legend of Prévost's Jansenism by showing how close his outlook is to that of such rationalist and materialist thinkers as Helvétius, since he accepts the principle of determinism, holds that man's character is the product of circumstance, of external causes, and takes up a completely utilitarian attitude to ethics. In spite of his

use of the nebulous terminology associated with *Geistesgeschichte*, Herr Müller succeeds in making several interesting points.

J. LOUGH.

ABERDEEN.

One cannot help feeling that the shade of Judith Gautier would be faintly amused if, from its dwelling across the Styx, it beheld this tribute of posterity in the form of a Doctorate thesis (*Judith Gautier, sa vie et son œuvre*. By M. Dita Camacho Paris: Droz. 1939. 208 pp.). For the delicate art of Judith, with its sophisticated and *fin-de-siècle* 'exotisme', is not easily reduced to a formula, nor is it possible to capture and fix on paper the capricious and wayward personality of Ernesta Grisi's daughter. M. Dita Camacho has made a brave effort to cope with these difficulties and it is not his fault if, in pinning the butterfly firmly to his cabinet, the fragile pattern of the wings becomes a little blurred. With the exception of a few letters to Pierre Loti, M. Camacho brings little fresh material to light in his study, which is based largely on Judith's own autobiographical sketches and various review articles and essays. But he has used this material effectively and methodically to construct a *vue d'ensemble* and to give a clear impression of the life and work of his subject.

Life and work are treated concurrently, a method which has the advantage of presenting a continuous narrative; but this advantage is counterbalanced by the fact that the analysis of the work is skimmed over rather lightly and the author's criticism is not always as full as the reader would like. In any case the story of Judith's life is the most interesting part of the thesis; the picture of her milieu and her own unforgettable portraits are an absorbing social document. With her unerring intuition about people she has fixed the Goncourt brothers for ever, and her malicious definition of their conversation: 'un duo tout spécial, où les voix alternaient sans se heurter ni se mêler jamais' and her final conclusion: 'quand ils sont là, on est très content de les voir . . . et cependant . . . on dirait qu'on entre en classe . . . qu'on n'a plus le droit de dire des bêtises', are worthy of the illustrious pair themselves. Intuition and imagination—these were the great qualities which enabled her to grasp the genius of Wagner and, in a different sphere, to catch not only the atmosphere of the Far East but even to recreate the tenuous nuances of Chinese poetry. Above all she was her father's daughter; she inherited his gift for plastic description; she shared his lack of creative genius; her style was equally vivid and varied but more supple and elastic. Judith gives us a water-colour where Théophile produces a painting in oils.

One would welcome fuller treatment of some points and more precise conclusions about them: for example, Judith's connexion with the *Parnassiens*; the exact manner in which she inspired Wagner; the relation of her poems to the *Parnasse* and Symbolism respectively. As for her Orientalism, surely contemporary influences and the teaching of Ting-Tun-Ling, her tutor in Chinese, are enough to account for it, and it is

hardly necessary to go back to the seventeenth century or even to Voltaire in search of an exotic tradition only indirectly involved in her case. But fuller treatment would have meant a work planned on an infinitely vaster scale. Taken as a whole M. Camacho's thesis forms a useful and valuable introduction to the study of Judith Gautier, competent and readable and furnished with excellent bibliographies.

L. A. BISSON.

OXFORD.

Professor Karl Vossler's *Einführung in die Spanische Dichtung des Goldenen Zeitalters* (Hamburg: Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut, *Ibero-Amerikanische Studien*, xii. 1939. 113 pp. R.M. 3.60) consists of six lectures delivered in Spanish at Santander in 1933 and already published in that language (Madrid: Cruz y Raya. 1934). Introductory chapters consider questions of language and style, and of literary forms in their relation to society: the remaining four survey religious, heroic, idyllic and satiric elements respectively. Professor Vossler has come late to Spanish literature, and warms infectiously to its merits. His enthusiasms, at times closely reasoned, are more often perhaps intuitive, and provocative in consequence to the more pedestrian mind. A turn of speech like *zeugma* is invested with deep esoteric significance (it is 'eine Art Beschwörung oder Wortzauber'), Garcilaso is deprived of inner significance because he stands apart from the 'dichterische Rechtgläubigkeit von Alt-Kastilien', and Lazarillo becomes a hero fighting for his honour. The author tends to treat *siglo de oro* literature as consistent if not identical in its values over two centuries, and in general to present inferences of broader philosophical import than his evidence will bear. It is from this point of view nevertheless, as a penetrating search for ethical rather than literary values, that the book will be esteemed by the initiate.

WILLIAM C. ATKINSON.

GLASGOW.

Three Centuries of Tirso de Molina, by Alice H. Bushee (Pennsylvania and Oxford University Presses. 1939. 111 pp. 9s.) consists chiefly of five articles reprinted from reviews concerning Tirso's posthumous reputation and matters bibliographical. Though 'in large part revised' for book form they have not been co-ordinated, and many statements and quotations appear twice or three times. Further 'Notes on Various Editions', being a footnote to Cotarelo, an Appendix of editions possessed by the author—which she generously makes available to other scholars—and 20 plates from early editions and manuscripts complete the book. In analysing the five *Partes* Professor Bushee makes no attempt to resolve the vexed question of which four, if only four, in the Second are to be regarded as Tirso's. There is equally no attempt at original criticism or evaluation in the two chapters that trace the ebb and flow of the dramatist's popularity. But wherever diligent reading has unearthed a reference to his name, however uncritical or casual, over two centuries—the last

hundred years of the title receive but a page or two—it will be found here. English names are strangely absent from the tale. The reference to ‘translations into French, Italian and German’ overlooks Harry Kemp’s free rendering of the *Burlador* (*The Love-Rogue*, New York, 1923).

WILLIAM C. ATKINSON.

GLASGOW.

With the advent of National Socialism it has become the national duty of the German professor to expound his subject for the benefit of the ‘Volksgemeinschaft’, and students of Germanic antiquities have found that the eulogy of the virtues of their Nordic ancestors has now a market value. This booklet by Professor S. Gutenbrunner, *Germanische Frühzeit in den Berichten der Antike* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1939. 209 pp. 3 M. 80), the third in the new series, *Handbucherei der Deutschkunde*, is written with the express purpose of making the early history of the Germanic peoples ‘zu einer Sache des ganzen Volkes’, but it may be stated at once that it is distinguished by an unbiased and level-headed appraisal of the facts which is in marked contrast to the many recently published handbooks on this subject. Only occasionally, as, for example, when the fondness of the Germani for service as mercenaries in the Roman army is attributed to the Phalian admixture in the Nordic stock does Professor Gutenbrunner allow his vision to be blurred by popular racial theories.

The title is somewhat misleading, for the book deals in the main with the scanty accounts of the Germanic peoples down to about the first century B.C. By a skilful combination of the results of archaeology and philology with the few details found in classical authors about the voyage of Pytheas and the amber trade and the invasion of the Cimbri and Teutoni Professor Gutenbrunner succeeds in sketching a vivid, and yet by no means fanciful, picture of early Germanic life. The volume also contains a well-written account of the origin of the name ‘Germani’, in which the etymology suggested by Much is accepted, and an appendix with extracts from the Greek and Latin authors discussed in the text and some excellent illustrations of objects excavated in recent years such as the Negau Helmet. In the opinion of the reviewer the exclusion of Tacitus’s *Germania* from this account of the ‘Germanische Frühzeit’ detracts from its value, but within its limits the book is an excellent piece of ‘haute vulgarisation’ which may be confidently recommended to University students in this country.

CHARLES T. CARR.

ST ANDREWS.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

July—September 1939

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON (English)

GENERAL

- Annuario del Centro Italiano di Studi Americani, xvii (1939). Rome, C. Colombo. L. 20.
- COWLEY, J. D., *Bibliographical Description and Cataloguing*. London, Grafton. 15s.
- DE STEFANO, A., *Riformatori ed Eretici, nel Medio Evo*. Palermo, Ciuni. L. 30.
- ENTWISTLE, W. J., *European Balladry*. Oxford, Univ. Press. 17s. 6d.
- IBN HAUKAL, *Opus geographicum*, ed. J. H. Kramers (*Bibl. geogr. Arabicorum*, 2, 1). Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 14 M.
- KADNER, S., *Rasse und Humor*. Munich, Lehmann. 3 M. 80.
- [NEILSON.] *Essays contributed in Honor of President William Allan Neilson* (Smith Coll. Stud. in Mod. Lang., xxi). Northampton, Mass., Smith College. \$2.00.
- NEWSTEAD, H., *Bran the Blessed in Arthurian Romance* (Columbia Univ. Stud. in Engl. and Comp. Lit., 141). Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 17s. 6d.
- Pastoral Elegy, The, An Anthology*, ed. by J. P. Harrison, Jr., English translations by H. J. Leon. Austin, Univ. Texas.
- PRINCE, J. D., *Fragments from Babel*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 14s.
- SCHEFFLER, K., *Form als Schicksal*. Erlenbach-Zurich, Rentsch. 3 M.
- TRUBETZKOY, N. S., *Grundzuge der Phonologie* (Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague). Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 12 M.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

- (HAUST.) *Mélanges de Linguistique romane offerts à M. Jean Haust*. Liège, Vaillant-Carmanne.
- PALFREY, T. R., J. G. FUCILLA and W. C. HOLBROOK, *A Bibliographical Guide to the Romance Languages and Literatures*. Evanston, Ill., Chandler's Inc.

Mediaeval Latin.

- SANTONASTASO, G., *Il Pensiero politico di Egidio Romano*. Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 5.

Italian.

- ARANGIO RUIZ, V., *Grandezza di Leopardi*. Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 5.
- BARBI, M., *Poesia popolare italiana*. Florence, Sansoni. L. 12.
- BATTISTI, C., *Dizionario toponomastico atesino*. Florence, Rinascimento del Libro. L. 2.75.
- CAMPANELLA, T., *Quod reminscentur*, ed. R. Amerio. Padua, CEDAM. L. 45.
- CARDELLI, F., *Oriani*. Bologna, Capelli. L. 15.
- [CARDUCCI, G.] *Epistolario fra Carducci e Isidoro del Lungo, 1898-1906*. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 18.
- Carta storica dell'Unità d'Italia*. Novara, Ist. geog. De Agostini. L. 60.
- COLLOTTI, F., *Saggio sul pensiero filosofico e civile di F. M. Pagano*. Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 10.

- CONDIVI, La Vita di Michelangelo, ed. A. Maraini. Florence, Rinascimento del Libro. L. 30.
- DENIS-BOULET, NOËLE, La Carrière politique de Sainte Catherine de Sienne. Paris, Desclée de Brouwer. 25 fr.
- DE ROBERTIS, G., Saggi. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 12.
- DE STEFANO, A., Federico III d' Aragona, Re di Sicilia, 1296-1337. Palermo, Ciuni. L. 12.
- DE STEFANO, A., La Cultura in Sicilia nel Periodo Normando. Palermo, Ciuni. L. 10.
- DE STEFANO, A., La Cultura alla Corte di Federico II Imperatore. Palermo, Ciuni. L. 20.
- FERRERO, G., L'Anima e la Poesia di Vittorio Alfieri, 2 ed. Turin, Paravia. L. 17.
- FOSCOLI, U., Lettere inedite a Marzia Martinengo, ed. Marpicati. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 18.
- FRANCHI, R., Memorie critiche. Florence, Parenti. L. 15.
- GALLETTI, A., L' Eloquenza dalle Origini al XVI secolo. Milan, Vallardi. L. 60.
- LEOPARDI, G., Canti. Florence, Rinascimento del Libro. L. 25.
- LEOPARDI, G., Diario d' Amore. Milan, Sonzogno. L. 4.
- MACHIAVELLI, N., Il Principe, ed. G. Lesca. Florence, Rinascimento del Libro. L. 30.
- MERESCHOWSKI, D., Dante. Zurich, Sperber. 4 M. 80.
- MICHELESI, M., L' Opera di Luigi De Sinner a favore di Leopardi. Florence, Tip. Giuntina. L. 20.
- PANZINI, A., Il Conte di Cavour. Milan, Mondadori. L. 18.
- RAVENNA, L., Il Giornalismo Mazziniano. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 30.
- VERCESI E SANTINI, L' Eloquenza dal secolo XVII ai giorni nostri. Milan, Vallardi. L. 50.

Spanish, Catalan, Basque.

- CALLE ITURRINO, Lope de Vega y clave de Fuenteovejuna. Bilbao, Dochao. 5 ptas.
- GARCÍA MERCADAL, J., La España Imperial: Cisneros. Zaragoza, Tip. La Académica. 6 ptas.
- GRACIÁN, B., El Criticón, ed. by M. Romera-Navarro, II. Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s.
- IBN EZRA, ABRAHAM, The Beginning of Wisdom, ed. R. Levy and F. Cantera. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 10s. 6d.
- LEÓN, R., Obras completas. Madrid, Suárez (in progress).
- LUQUENS, F. B., Spanish American Literature in the Yale University Library. A Bibliography. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 45s.
- MACHADO, M., Poetas de España. Valladolid, Impr. Castellana. 5 ptas.
- MADRAZO, F. DE, Zumalacárregui. Zaragoza, Tip. la Académica. 1 pta. 50.
- NERVO (Barón de), La España Imperial: Isabel la Católica. Zaragoza, Tip. la Académica. 6 ptas.
- OLMEDO, FÉLIX G., Humanistas y pedagogos españoles: Juan Bonifacio y la cultura literaria del siglo de oro. Santander, Aldus. 10 ptas.
- PAZOS, E. R., De Patre Antonio Lhinas collegiorum missionariorum in Hispania et America fundatore. Vich, Edit. Seráfica. 5 ptas.
- RUIZ, JUAN, Libro de Buen Amor, ed. F. F. Corso. Buenos Aires, Perlado.
- SILIÓ CORTÉS, C., Isabel la Católica. Valladolid, Impr. Castellana. 16 ptas.

Portuguese.

- BACELAR, J., *Da Variabilidade do romance português de interesse universal*. Lisbon, Seara Nova.
- GREENLEE, W. B., *The Voyage of Pedro Álvares Cabral to Brazil and India* (Hakluyt Society). London, Quaritch. 25s
- GUERRIERI CROCETTI, C., *La Lirica del Camões*. Genoa, Degli Orfini. L. 10.
- VIANNA MOOG, *Eça de Queiroz e o século XIX*. Porto Alegre (Brazil), Liv. do Globo.

French, Provençal.

(a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- BALDENSBERGER, F., *Études d'histoire littéraire*. 3^e et 4^e séries. Paris, Droz.
- COLLIER, B., *Catalan France*. London, Dent 18s
- EISEMANN, K. E., *Das alemannische Lehngut in der ostfranzösischen Mundart von Schnerlach (Lapoutroie) in den Vogesen* (Leipz. rom. St. 1. 20) Born, Noske 6 M.
- HEUSSLER, F., *Hyperkorrekte Sprachformen in den Mundarten der französischen Schweiz und in anderen Sprachgebieten* Diss. Winterthur, Buchdr. Winterthur.
- KOHLER, FRIEDA, *Die Formen des Imperfekts in Frankreich* Diss. Würzburg, Tritsch.
- PRATT, W. S., *The Music of the French Psalter of 1562*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 16s. 6d.
- SCHULTZ, W., *Die Tiere in der Namengebung der sudfranzösischen Mundarten*. Diss. Hamburg, Preilipper.
- VALLÉE, F., *Grand Dictionnaire français-breton*. Paris, Libr. du Régionalisme. 75 fr.

(b) *Old French.*

- ARNOULD, E. J. F., *Henry of Lancaster and his 'Livre des Seintes Medicines'*. Manchester Univ. Press. 1s. 6d
- DUPIRE, N., *Les Faicts et dits de Jean Molinet (SATF)*. Paris, Droz. 60 fr.
- HALBACH, K. H., *Französentum und Deutschtum in hofischer Dichtung des Staufenzeitalters: Hartmann von Aue und Crestien des Troyes; Iwein-Ivain* (Neue Dt. Forsch. 7). Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 8 M. 50.
- MICHA, A., *La Tradition manuscrite des romans de Chrétien de Troyes*. Paris, Droz. 100 fr.
- THUASNE, L., *Œuvres de François Villon*. Paris, Picard. 18 fr.

(c) *Modern French*

- ABERDAM, RENÉE, etc., *Hommage à André Spire*. Paris, Lipschutz 25 fr.
- ARLAND, M., etc., *Hommage à Eugène Dabit*. Paris, NRF. 16 fr. 50.
- ARVIN, H. C., *Alexandre Dumas fils*. Paris, Presses Universitaires. 3s. 6d.
- BAYLE, P., *Pensées diverses sur la comète*, ed. crit. A. Prat. Paris, Droz. 60 fr.
- BENDZ, E., *André Gide et l'art d'écrire*. Paris, Messageries du Livre. 18 fr.
- BERTHOUD, S., *Trois doctrines: Charles Secrétan, J.-J. Gourd, L. Braunschvicg*. Paris, Attinger. 36 fr.
- BLIN, G., *Baudelaire*. Paris, NRF. 42 fr.
- BO, C., *Delle Immagini giovanili di Sainte Beuve*. Florence, Parenti. L. 35.
- COLE, C. W., *Colbert and a century of French Mercantilism*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 50s.

- CRUCHET, R., *La Médecine et les médecins dans la littérature française*. Paris, Delmas. 25 fr.
- DABIT, E., *Journal intime, 1928-36*. Paris, NRF. 28 fr.
- DITA CAMACHO, M., *Judith Gautier*. Paris, Droz. 30 fr.
- DUCLOS, G. P., *Considérations sur les mœurs*, ed. by F. C. Green. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 5s.
- Études sur la vie et les œuvres de Racine (num. spéc. de *La Muse Française*). Paris, Garnier. 12 fr.
- FALCUCCI, G., *Le problème de la vérité chez Pascal*. Toulouse, Privat. 30 fr.
- FOGELBERG, THELMA, *La langue et le style de Paul Adam*. Paris, Droz. 40 fr.
- FOWLIE, E., Ernest Psichari. London, Clarke. 3s. 6d.
- GROU, J., *Écrivains du Midi*. Paris, Floury. 18 fr.
- HENNEPIN, L., *Description of Louisiana*, trsl. M. E. Cross. Minnesota and Oxford Univ. Presses. 16s.
- HESS, G., Pierre Gassend (*Berliner Beitr. z. rom. Ph.*, 9, 3-4). Jena, Gronau. 10 M.
- HIRSCH, M., Anselme Mathieu (*Rom. Arb.* xxviii). Halle, Niemeyer. 9 M.
- JONES, KATHLEEN, *La revue britannique, 1825-40*. Paris, Droz. 24 fr.
- KRAKEUR, L. G., *La correspondance de Diderot*. New York, Kingsley Press. \$1.50.
- MAULNIER, T., *Introduction à la poésie française* (new ed.). Paris, NRF. 30 fr.
- MUSSET, A. DE, *Nouvelles et contes*. Paris, Conard. 45 fr.
- PAUL-ÉMILE (Sœur), *Le Renouveau Marial dans la littérature française depuis Chateaubriand jusqu'à nos jours*. Paris, Spes. 18 fr.
- PLAQUEVENT, J., *Léonard Constant, 1880-1923*. Paris, Seuil. 15 fr.
- RIVELINE, M., *Montaigne et l'amitié*. Paris, Alcan. 40 fr.
- ROUSARD, *Œuvres complètes*, x (STFM), ed. P. Laumonier. Paris, Droz. 40 fr.
- SCHWARTZ, W. L., and C. B. OLSEN, *The Sententiae in the Dramas of Corneille*. Stanford and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$2.00.
- STENDHAL, *Promenades dans Rome*, ii, ed. A. Caraccio. Paris, Champion. 120 fr.
- Tableau de la littérature française, 1: XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles* (De Corneille à Chénier). Paris, NRF. 60 fr.
- VERLAINE, *Poésies*, 8 vols, ed. Y.-G. Le Dantec. Paris, Cluny. 120 fr.
- VIALA TOUX, J., *De Durkheim à Bergson*. Paris, Bloud et Gay. 60 fr.
- WILSON, J. A., *The Pre-War Biographies of Romain Rolland*. London, H. Milford (for St Andrew's University). 10s. 6d.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Scandinavian.

- SVANBERG, N., *Tegnérstudier. Stildrag i lyriken till 1826*. (Nord. Text. och Undersök., 13.) Copenhagen, Einar Munksgaard. Kr. 7.

English.

(a) *General (including Linguistic)*.

- BNER, H., *Führen und Folgen, Herrschen und Beherrschtwerden im Sprachgut der Angelsachsen*. Breslau, Priebsch. 12 M. 50.
- CATLIN, G., *The Anglo-Saxon Tradition*. Routledge; Kegan Paul. 10s. 6d.
- CHAPMAN, R. W., *Adjectives from Proper Names* (S.P.E. Tract No. 11). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.
- CLASSE, A., *The Rhythm of English Prose*. Oxford, Blackwell. 10s. 6d.

COWLING, G., *Essays in the Use of English*. Melbourne and Oxford Univ. Presses. 6s.

Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles, ed. by Sir W. Craigie and J. R. Hulbert. Part VI. Chicago and Oxford Univ. Presses. 17s.

HORWILL, H. W., *An Anglo-American Interpreter. A Vocabulary and Phrase Book*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s 6d.

URBAN, M. W., *Language and Reality*. London, Allen and Unwin. 21s.

WILDE, H.-O., *Vom Leben der englischen Hochsprache in Gegenwart und Geschichte* (Stud. engl. Phil., xcvi). Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M. 40.

WILHELMSEN, L. J., *On the Verbal Prefixes for- and fore- in English*. Oslo, J. Dybwad. Kr. 2.

(b) *Old and Middle English*.

Anglo-Saxon Charters, edited with Translations and Notes by A. J. Robertson. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 25s.

ARNOULD, E. J. F., *Richard Rolle and a Bishop. A Vindication*. Manchester, Univ. Press and The John Rylands Library. 1s. 6d.

ARNOULD, E. J. F., *Richard Rolle and the Sorbonne*. Manchester, Univ. Press and The John Rylands Library. 1s. 6d.

BRODEUR, A. G., *Arthur, Dux Bellorum* (Univ. Cal. Publ. in Engl., Vol. 3, No. 7). Berkeley, Cal., Univ. of California Press. 50 c.

Cartulary of Missenden Abbey, The, Part I, ed. by J. G. Jenkins. Buckingham Archaeological Society.

CHAUCER, G., *La Novella del Chierico di Oxford, da un codice inglese inedito del xv secolo* (with facsimile). Ed. by J. Vallese. Naples, Amodio. L. 20.

JEKYLL, G., and S. R. JONES, *Old English Household Life*. London, Batsford. 7s. 6d.

JONES, C. W., *Beda's Pseudepigrapha: Scientific Writings Falsely Attributed to Bede*. Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 14s.

Medieval Studies, ed. by W. R. W. Koehler. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 105s.

PATCH, H. R., *On Rereading Chaucer*. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 10s. 6d.

Paynel Fee, *The, Early Yorkshire Charters*. Vol. vi. Based on the Manuscripts of the late W. Farrer and ed. by C. T. Clay. (Yorkshire Archaeological Society.) 25s.

Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century, ed. by Carleton Brown. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d.

RYAN, A. M., *A Map of Old English Monasteries and Related Ecclesiastical Foundations A.D. 400-1066* (Cornell Stud. in Engl., xxviii). Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 4s. 6d.

WILSON, R. M., *Early Middle English Literature*. London, Methuen. 8s. 6d.

(c) *Modern English*.

BALL, R. H., *The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach*. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 22s. 6d.

Ballads and Songs of Southern Michigan, ed. by E. E. Gardner and G. J. Chickering. Michigan and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s.

BRAWN, I., and G. FEARON, *The Shakespeares and the Birthplace*. Stratford-on-Avon, Fox. 1s.

British Dramatists from Dryden to Sheridan, ed. by G. H. Nettleton and A. E. Case. London, Harrap. 15s.

- BROOKS, C., *Modern Poetry and the Tradition*. North Carolina and Oxford Univ. Presses. 14s.
- Diary of Dudley Ryder, 1715-1716, ed. by W. Matthews. London, Methuen. 16s.
- EVELYN, J., *The Life of Mrs Godolphin*, ed. by H. Sampson. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.
- FETTERMAN, J., *In Praise of Comedy*. London, Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.
- FERGUSON, D., *Pride and Passion. Robert Burns 1759-1796*. Oxford Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.
- FORD, F. M., *The March of Literature*. London, Allen and Unwin. 16s.
- GABLE, J. H., *Bibliography of Robin Hood*. Lincoln, Univ. of Nebraska. 75 c.
- GRAY, A., *Shakespeare's Son-in-Law John Hall*. Cambridge, Heffer. 2s. 6d.
- GROOM, B., *On the Diction of Tennyson, Browning and Arnold* (S.P.E. Tract No. LIII). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d.
- GWYNN, S., *Robert Louis Stevenson*. London, Macmillan. 6s.
- HENDERSON, P., *The Poet and Society*. London, Seeker and Warburg. 7s. 6d.
- HOWE, M. A. D., *Holmes and the Breakfast Table*. Oxford, Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.
- IRVINE, W., *Walter Bagshot*. London, Longmans Green. 12s. 6d.
- JACKSON, R. W., *Jonathan Swift*. S.P.C.K. 6s.
- Kings Quair, *The*, ed. by W. M. Mackenzie. London, Faber and Faber. 7s. 6d.
- KNIGHT, G. W., *The Burning Oracle*. London, Oxford Univ. Press., 12s. 6d.
- McPECK, J. A. S., *Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain* (Harvard Stud. in Comp. Lit., 15). Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 21s.
- PARKER, W. R., *Milton's Debt to Greek Tragedy*. Oxford, Univ. Press. 11s. 6d.
- PETTER, G. B., *George Meredith and his German Critics*. London, Witherby. 10s. 6d.
- PIERCE, J. K., *Studies in Literary Types in Seventeenth Century America*. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 16s.
- PINNEY, JOHN, *The Letters of, 1679-1699*, ed. by G. F. Nuttall. Oxford, Univ. Press. 6s.
- POPE, A., *Imitations of Horace*, ed. by J. Butt. Twickenham Edition, Vol. iv. London, Methuen. 15s.
- Pursuit of Poetry, The. A book of Letters about Poetry. Written by English Poets, 1550-1930*, collected and ed. by D. Flower. London, Cassell. 10s. 6d.
- ROSENFELD, S., *Strolling Players and Drama in the Provinces, 1660-1765*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 15s.
- SEILLERE, E., *L'Actualité de Carlyle*. Paris, Nouvelle Revue Critique.
- SIEBECK, B., *Das Bild Sir Philip Sidneys in der englischen Renaissance*. Weimar, H. Bohlau Nachf. 7 M. 05.
- STOREY, G., *Dickens and Daughter*. London, Muller. 10s. 6d.
- SUTHERLAND, J., *Background for Queen Anne*. London, Methuen. 10s. 6d.
- TEMPLEMAN, W. D., *The Life and Work of William Gilpin* (Illinois Stud. in Lang. and Lit., xxiv, 3-4). Urbana, Univ. Illinois Press. \$3.00.
- UDALL, N., *Roister Doister*, ed. by G. Scheurweghs (Bangs Materialen, N.S. 16). Louvain, Libraire Universitaire.
- WILSON, J. D., *Through Elizabethan Eyes*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 2s.
- Wordsworth and Coleridge. Studies in honor of George McLean Harper*, ed. by E. L. Griggs. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s.

HAMLET'S TREATMENT OF OPHELIA IN THE
NUNNERY SCENE

I

HAMLET's treatment of Ophelia in the Nunnery scene formed the subject of a thoughtful contribution by Miss Helen L. Gardner in the issue of the *Modern Language Review* dated July 1938. The subject is one that has provoked much discussion. Dr Dover Wilson would motivate Hamlet's sudden fury against Ophelia by positing an earlier entry for him in Act II, sc. II, and thus making him overhear Polonius's scheme about 'loosing his daughter to him'. According to this interpretation, Hamlet would be aware of the presence of spies behind the arras in the Nunnery scene and be deliberately talking at them; his fury against Ophelia personally would be the result of his knowledge that she was a decoy.¹ Miss Gardner very ably shows how such an interpretation goes against the usual Shakespearean technique in the matter of overhearing. She thinks that it is quite in consonance with 'the whole rhythm of the play' that Hamlet's fury against Ophelia should be unmotivated; for the whole play turns on the incalculability of Hamlet's behaviour and is consequently full of violent emotional contrasts, abrupt explosions of feeling and 'sudden absolute alterations of tension'.

It is the object of this paper to show that Hamlet's treatment of Ophelia in the Nunnery scene is quite understandable psychologically, without calling for such mechanical motivation as suggested by Dr Dover Wilson. Nor is it necessary to assume that Hamlet's treatment of Ophelia is unmotivated because the rhythm of the play demands it to be so.

Let us see first in what state of mind Hamlet confronts Ophelia in the Nunnery scene.

II

To Hamlet's fine, sensitive nature there comes a tremendous shock—the shock of a father's murder by the hands of his own brother and of the adulterous marriage of a mother with the murderer himself. That shock bears Hamlet down. As is the way with introspective natures, Hamlet's personal problem becomes for him also the problem of life. In his very

¹ Dover Wilson, *What Happens in 'Hamlet'* (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 101–14, 125–36.

first soliloquy, the contemplation of 'the o'erhasty marriage' of his mother leads on to morbid generalizations: 'Frailty, thy name is woman!'¹ and again:

How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable
Seem to me all the uses of this world!
Fie on't! O fie! 'tis an unweeded garden
That grows to seed; things rank and gross in nature
Possess it merely.

The contradictions of life prove too much for the young prince. He knows what a piece of work is a man, but he also gets to know that one may smile, and smile, and be a damned villain. He is so conscious of the beauties of creation, but he also gets to experience it as a pestilent congregation of vapours. He is unable to reconcile these incongruities; and this inability unmakes the man.

And this tragedy of Hamlet is intensified by his loneliness. People in his situation are in real need of that spiritual sympathy that alleviates 'soul-torment'. In a somewhat analogous situation, Prospero is able to accept life with all its contradictions, which Hamlet cannot. It is a possibility worth considering how much of this is due to the fact that Prospero has a daughter like Miranda. Hamlet, however, is not equally fortunate. He is alone. Even Horatio does not know 'how ill all's here about his heart'.² There is Ophelia, and naturally Hamlet would expect much from her. But even she (without knowing it: she is too simple to know) fails him. Hence Hamlet's bitterness against Ophelia.

At a moment when Hamlet's need of understanding companionship is the greatest, when he has been filled with a spirit of bitterness against the world, and—worse still—when his disgust at his mother's conduct has already generalized itself into a doubt of womankind, Ophelia, at the behest of her father, repels his letters and denies his access to her (II, i, 108-10). Her action seems to provide Hamlet with an unexpected confirmation of his 'Frailty, thy name is woman!' But it is a painful confirmation, too, coming as it does from his own beloved. The resulting distraction on the part of Hamlet is easily imaginable. The way he visits Ophelia in her closet—'his doublet all unbraced' etc. (see Ophelia's description in II, i, 77-100)—is no mere 'putting on' of 'an antic disposition'. When he takes her by the wrist and falls to perusal of her face, does he expect to find 'Frailty' writ large there? And then think of the way he goes out, with a sigh that seems 'to shatter all his bulk', looking

¹ All quotations from *Hamlet* are from the Arden edition (ed. Dowden, London, 1919). Other Shakespearean references are to the Globe edition (London, 1924).

² v, ii, 221

at Ophelia over his shoulders to the last! The whole thing bespeaks the agonized lover—the lover who has had a sudden and profound shock. He has been disappointed where he had hoped most; he thinks he has been deceived where he had most trusted. That his own beloved should belong to the rank, unweeded garden—to the pestilent congregation of vapours!

It is in this state of mind that Hamlet encounters Ophelia in III. i. His bitterness against her there would not be a surprise after all this. And in the scene itself there are aggravating factors.

III

Coming now to the Nunnery scene itself, enter Hamlet meditating. There are two movements of the soul in his soliloquy. The first is one of a weariness of life—a thing we have already noticed in him: the world has become for him 'an unweeded garden', the earth 'a sterile promontory', man 'a quintessence of dust'. The greater part of his soliloquy is accordingly an expression of a profound disgust with life, even with death. At this point his eyes fall on Ophelia. According to her father's instructions (III, i, 44–9), she is poring over a book of devotions. The sight for a moment turns the current of Hamlet's soul. For once we have a glimpse of the old Hamlet—the sensitive fine-souled young man who knew love and was so intensely conscious of the beauty of life.¹ Here, for once, before him is a bit of that beauty he loved so well. The fair Ophelia! His own beautiful beloved at her devotions! The old passion flames up anew at the sight—the hunger for love is felt once more, the hunger for spiritual sympathy, for understanding companionship:

Soft you now!
The fair Ophelia! Nymph, in thy orisons
Be all my sins remember'd.²

¹ Cf. that speech of his in II, ii, 312–23: 'this goodly frame, the earth, etc.'

² To save his theory Dr Dover Wilson would read this speech as sardonic (*op. cit.*, p. 128). This is, perhaps, the part of his theory that one finds most difficult to accept. The warmth and wistfulness of the speech are unmistakable, thus proving that Hamlet has no suspicions that Ophelia is (as instructed by her father in III, i, 45–6) merely colouring her loneliness with the show of an exercise. Dr Dover Wilson finds 'deliberate affectation' in the words *nymph* and *orisons*. Not that these words do not lend themselves to affectation. But has not Shakespeare used them seriously more than once? See, for *nymph*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, v, iv, 12, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, II, i, 245, III, ii, 137, IV, i, 131; for *orisons*, *Henry V*, II, ii, 53, *Romeo and Juliet*, IV, iii, 3, *Cymbeline*, I, iii, 32. Dowden's remark, 'Yet there is estrangement in the word "Nymph"', (*ed. cit.*, p. 102), which Dr Dover Wilson quotes, does not help him; for the context of that remark is 'For a moment Hamlet has been touched by the sight of Ophelia with her book of prayers'. After having accepted *beautified* as 'innocent' (*op. cit.*, p. 113), there is no reason why Dr Dover Wilson should boggle at *nymph* and *orisons*.

Here, then, is a situation fraught with possibilities. If only Ophelia can rise to it! But think of the tragedy—how she spoils the situation with one unfortunate expression! In her confusion (natural to a simple girl like her in her situation) she accosts Hamlet thus:

Good my lord,
How does your honour for this *many a day*?¹

Many a day! But she had met Hamlet only the day before.² I am not sure if the tragic significance of this 'many a day' of Ophelia's has been sufficiently appreciated. It lends almost a touch of fatality to the situation. That an unfortunate expression blurted out at a moment of confusion³ should thus work havoc with a promising situation! The expression hurts Hamlet in two ways. For one thing, it is a lie (to Hamlet, of course: Ophelia does not know what she says). One more unpleasant reminder of his earlier generalization, 'Frailty, thy name is woman!', it makes Hamlet suspect that Ophelia is not genuine, that she is not honest (the suspicion finds wild expression shortly afterwards: 'Ha, ha! are you honest?'). For another, the expression gives the feeling of a great distance between Hamlet and Ophelia; as if her lover did no longer matter to Ophelia, so much so that she has forgotten his visit in course of a day. No wonder Hamlet revolts. All the warmth of that 'Soft you now...' is quenched in a moment, and Hamlet's reply is very cold: 'I humbly thank you; well, well, well.'⁴

But Ophelia does not stop there. Impelled as it were by a malignant

¹ Italics mine.

² In II, i Ophelia runs in to report to her father Hamlet's strange visit to her in her closet. It is evident from her speech and manners that she has come in immediately after Hamlet has left. The scene closes with Polonius's remark. 'Come, go we to the king. This must be known, etc.' In the next scene (II, ii) Polonius is before the King and the Queen, announcing that he has discovered 'the very cause of Hamlet's lunacy'. Then (in the same scene) the players come in and Hamlet arranges with them to have 'the Murder of Gonzago' played 'to-morrow night' (l. 575). The next scene (III, i the Nunnery scene) takes place the very next day: referring to the players, Rosencrantz says that 'they have already order This night to play before him (Hamlet)' (ll. 20-21).

³ Dr Dover Wilson suggests that Ophelia implies that Hamlet has neglected her (*op. cit.*, p. 129). This, however, would be attributing to her an artfulness of which, one should think, she was incapable.

⁴ The sudden revulsion may be compared to what happens in II, ii, 230-36. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern come in. The sight of old friends stirs the heart of Hamlet and he has a warm welcome for them: 'My excellent good friends! How dost thou, Guildenstern?—Ah, Rosencrantz! Good lads, how do ye both?' Their replies, however, are too subtle:

R. As the indifferent children of the earth

G. Happy in that we are not over-happy.

On fortune's cap we are not the very button.

Hamlet at once grows cold: 'Nor the soles of her shoe?'

It no doubt adds to Hamlet's bitterness against mankind that his efforts after companionship, after sympathy, in his moment of agony, should thus meet with repeated rebuffs.

It will be seen in passing that on the view taken here the Nunnery scene acquires a tragic poignancy that is lost by Dr Dover Wilson's interpretation.

fate, she proceeds to make the situation worse by offering to return his presents. Hamlet grows colder:

No, not I;
I never gave you aught.

For once Ophelia is importunate; for once, too, she grows loquacious and adds unfortunate remarks:

...their perfume lost,
Take these again; for to the noble mind
Rich gifts wax poor when givers prove unkind.
There, my lord.¹

This proves too much for Hamlet: he can no longer contain himself, and his simmering bitterness bubbles forth into 'wild and whirling words' (to quote Horatio in I, v, 133): 'Ha, ha! are you honest?' From here onwards the scene is a crescendo of bitterness. And Hamlet's bitterness is all the greater for Ophelia's confusion. Her very simplicity and meekness prove her undoing. If only she had been a Portia or a Rosalind! If only she had protested and thus assured Hamlet that she was not part of the 'unweeded garden'! Poor girl! she is only bewildered, and her brief, confused replies make Hamlet feel all the more as if she has been hiding a lie within. Thus, unknowingly to herself, she entirely fails her lover in his hour of the greatest need for spiritual sympathy. No wonder Hamlet's words to her are so wildly bitter. Coleridge attributed Hamlet's harshness to a perception that Ophelia was playing the decoy, so that 'his after-speeches are not so much directed to her as to the listeners and spies'.² He could, however, have given a better explanation of it by citing his own lines from *Christabel*:

...to be wroth with one we love,
Doth work like madness in the brain.

Hamlet himself says as much: 'Go to, I'll no more on't; it hath made me mad.'

It may be noted in passing that Hamlet's particular bitterness against Ophelia and his general bitterness against life and the world reinforce each other in the scene. That Ophelia should be so frail as to succumb so easily to the 'pestilent congregation of vapours'! Again, what a world is this that it should turn a flower like Ophelia so rapidly into

¹ The speech is undoubtedly too 'perfumed' for Ophelia. There is no evidence for it, but one would like to believe that she has been tutored in such phrases by her father. At any rate, there is reason to suppose that the lines just quoted are not exactly her own. 'Their perfume lost' recalls Laertes's reference to Hamlet's love for Ophelia in I, iii, 9 as 'the perfume and suppliance of a minute'; while the rhyme in the second and third lines shows them to be an aphorism committed to memory. What is important to note here is that the 'perfumed' character of the speech has only the unfortunate effect of aggravating Hamlet's suspicions of Ophelia's insincerity.

² Coleridge, *Essays and Lectures on Shakespeare* (Everyman's Library, 1926, p. 151).

a weed! (What a world, we may add after an earlier remark of Hamlet, that even the sun, kissing carrion, should only breed maggots!) Hence, it should be noted, Hamlet's bitter words in this scene are directed not only against Ophelia but also against the world in general: 'We are arrant knaves, all; believe none of us' or 'I say, we will have no more marriages.' He does not except even himself: 'I could accuse me of such things, that it were better my mother had not borne me.' Hence, the world being such, 'to a nunnery, go'.¹ There is some hope for Ophelia there yet. If she cannot save herself from further contamination there, at least she can save herself from spreading further contamination: she would not be 'a breeder of sinners'!

IV

One or two other points may be noted in conclusion. The first is about Hamlet's description of Polonius as a *fishmonger* in II, ii, 173-4. Taking *loose* and *fishmonger* as Elizabethan cant terms relating to bawdry, Dr Dover Wilson interprets this as a sly allusion to Polonius's talk about loosing his daughter to Hamlet and thus finds in it a confirmation of his theory that Hamlet has overheard Polonius's scheme. But, surely, that was not the only sense in which the words were used by the Elizabethans. The normal sense of *fishmonger* yields excellent meaning here.² Polonius is a fishmonger: he is there to fish out Hamlet's secrets and sell them to the King.

Of Polonius's *loose* Dr Dover Wilson writes that 'this was the meaning intended' (*op. cit.* p. 104). It could not have been, of course, intended by Polonius himself, speaking before the King and the Queen. Nor need it have been intended by the dramatist for his audience. In the text the expression may well bear a straightforward meaning. The metaphor is that of loosing a hound. Polonius would be hunting up Hamlet, as it were.

A similar allusion to an overheard plot is discovered by Dr Dover Wilson in the following remarks of Hamlet:

Hamlet. For if the sun breed maggots in a dead dog, being a good kissing carrion,—
Have you a daughter?

Polonius. I have, my lord.

Hamlet. Let her not walk i' the sun: . . . friend, look to 't.

¹ Another expression which Dr Dover Wilson would claim as a confirmation of his theory, since, he says, nunnery was in common Elizabethan use a cant term for a house of ill-fame (*op. cit.*, p. 134). But would such a *double entente* come easy to a speaker as agitated as Hamlet is here?

² The two earliest examples given by *O.E.D.* of the normal sense of the word date back to 1464 and 1594 respectively.

But it is quite possible to understand these lines without assuming that Hamlet is aware of Polonius's plot. For one thing, Polonius would naturally remind Hamlet of Ophelia. For, when Ophelia repels his letters and denies his access to her, it does not take long for a man of Hamlet's intelligence to realize who is behind that move. So here is one for Polonius: 'You are right! Your daughter should keep to her closet. She must not walk abroad. For the world is an evil place. Even the sun only breeds maggots in carrion. And she, like others, is only a bit of corrupt flesh!' Thus Hamlet seems to find a peculiarly ironical justification for Polonius's interdict on their courtship in his present disgust with life, in his view of the universe as 'a pestilent congregation of vapours'. Taken this way, the lines acquire a profounder significance and become more characteristic of Hamlet than they would on Dr Dover Wilson's interpretation.

Moreover, that query, 'Have you a daughter?' is not really so abrupt as to call for Dr Dover Wilson's assumption. It is induced by its immediate context: the words 'breed' and 'kissing' naturally lead on to thoughts of Ophelia.

Similarly, it is quite possible to understand the query, 'Where's your father?' in the Nunnery scene, without assuming that Hamlet is aware of his being overheard or even that there is a slight movement in the arras at this point. It is a counterpart to that question in II, ii: 'Have you a daughter?'; as Miss Gardner puts it in her paper, 'Polonius and Ophelia are linked in Hamlet's mind'. Hamlet has already come to know Polonius as a foolish busybody who has tried to fish out his secret and stood between him and Ophelia. Moreover, Ophelia has just insisted on returning his gifts, and in a 'perfumed' speech too; and Hamlet sees in it once more the hand of Polonius. Hence 'let the doors be shut upon him, that he may play the fool no where but in 's own house'.

Here, too, the query is not really so abrupt as it seems. It is induced by its context: 'We are arrant knaves, all: believe none of us. Go thy ways to a nunnery. Where's your father?' 'Arrant knaves': mark. And to Hamlet Polonius is one such. Does not Hamlet call him 'a foolish prating knave' afterwards (III, iv, 215)?

One other remark of Hamlet in the Nunnery scene calls for some comment: 'I say, we will have no more marriages: those that are married already, all but one, shall live; the rest shall keep as they are.' Those who would have it that Hamlet is conscious of his being overheard, would of course say that the phrase, 'all but one', is meant for the ears of the King. But is it not rather meant for the speaker himself? If Hamlet

152 *Hamlet's Treatment of Ophelia in the Nunnery Scene*

was aware of the King's presence behind the arras, would he have knowingly put him on his guard by uttering such an ominous phrase?¹

And, in each case, the dramatic effectiveness of the remark lies precisely in this, that it hits the mark without being intended to.

TARAKNATH SEN.

CALCUTTA.

¹ Dr Dover Wilson, of course, has his explanation of the point: an explanation deduced from his elaborate though disputable theory about Hamlet 'posing as the discontented heir thirsting for revenge'. This, however, is outside the purview of this paper

CHRISTIAN LIBERTY IN MILTON'S DIVORCE PAMPHLETS

I

ATTENTION has recently been drawn to the place in Milton's thought occupied by the doctrine of Christian liberty. Professor Woodhouse has called it 'the very corner-stone of his theory of toleration'.¹ Professor Sewell has written of its developing significance in his theology.² It is one of the central principles in his thought on the revolution, especially in the pamphlets of 1659; the chapter devoted to it in *De Doctrina Christiana* is of crucial importance to his theory of regeneration; and it is the theological equivalent of that 'Paradise within thee happier far' achieved by Adam and, in their different ways, by the heroes of his last poems.

Professor Woodhouse remarks that in Milton's writings the doctrine 'occurs from 1642 onwards'.³ Professor Sewell would agree, with reservations. In his view, Milton's heterodox interpretation was fully developed only after 1659 when he was engaged in a revision of the Picard manuscript of *De Doctrina*. Its appearances in his writings before that time do not seem to him remarkably peculiar.⁴ I believe that the first dating is somewhat too early, that the second is far too late, and that it is possible to fix with a considerable degree of accuracy the time at which Milton became aware of the full significance of the doctrine and began to interpret it heretically.

It is impossible to say when Milton first learned of the doctrine. He does not refer to it before 1641, but he must have become acquainted with it as soon as he began to consider Christian theology. Its primary source is Galatians; it was prominent in Protestant theology because it crystallized justification by faith rather than works; every compendium discussed it, and it had been particularly treated by Luther in *Concerning*

¹ *Puritanism and Liberty*, p. [65] Professor Woodhouse first noted the importance of the doctrine in Milton and his contemporaries in 'Puritanism and Liberty' and 'Milton, Puritanism and Liberty', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, iv (1935), 395-404, 483-513.

² *A Study in Milton's Christian Doctrine*, pp. 5-6, 12-13, 22-6, 51-3, 62-9, 185-6. See also 'Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana*', *Essays and Studies of the English Association*, xix (1934), 40-66, and 'Milton and the Mosaic Law', *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxx (1935), 13-18.

³ *Puritanism and Liberty*, p. 66. Professor Woodhouse was calling attention to the general influence of the doctrine on Puritan thought in the 1640's. My colleague and former instructor would agree that Milton's interpretation developed after 1642.

⁴ *A Study*, pp. 51-3.

Christian Liberty and by Calvin in his *Institutes*, book 3, chapter 19. The two last were probably the chief sources of the orthodox interpretation among Protestants. They do not differ materially, though Luther's discussion is remarkable for its assertion of the spiritual privileges of the saints as prophets, priests, and kings, and Calvin's for its succinct statement of the legal significance.¹

Calvin provides the norm. He distinguishes three parts of Christian liberty. (1) 'The consciences of believers, while seeking the assurance of their justification before God, must rise above the Law and think no more of obtaining justification by it.' (2) Christians 'obey the Law, not as if compelled by legal necessity, but being freed from the yoke of the Law itself, voluntarily obey the will of God'. (3) 'We are not bound before God to any observance of external things which are in themselves indifferent, but are at full liberty to use or omit them.'² The doctrine is essentially a formulation of the difference between the old and new dispensations. Christians are freed from the imposed righteousness of the Law, though it still teaches, exhorts, and urges them to good;³ their obedience is the spontaneous result of grace, not the result of external compulsion;⁴ and all things concerning which there is no positive gospel prohibition are sanctified to their use.⁵ Involved in these statements is the orthodox opinion that Christ's sacrifice abrogated the ceremonial and civil parts of the Mosaic Law, though the moral remains in force.⁶

Calvin was careful to insist that Christian liberty 'is in all its parts a spiritual matter' and is perverted by those 'who think there is no liberty unless it be used in the presence of men'.⁷ The history of the doctrine in Puritan England is largely the record of its progressive transference from the theological to the ecclesiastical and political spheres, to the first through Congregationalism and the toleration controversy, to the second by the force of analogy among the Levellers.⁸ Calvin had himself said that because 'believers have derived authority from Christ not to entangle themselves by the observance of things in which he wished them to be free, we conclude that their consciences are exempted from all

¹ *Luther's Primary Works*, ed. Wace and Buckheim, pp. 264-70. See also the commentaries on Galatians by Luther and Perkins, Ames' *Medulla*, Usher's *Body of Divinity*, and the *Westminster Confession*.

² *Institutes*, trans. Beveridge, II, pp. 131-4.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 131.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁶ Cf. Article VII: 'Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the Civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments called Moral.'

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 135.

⁸ See Woodhouse, *op. cit.*, pp. [65-71], for a succinct account of this process.

human authority'.¹ The Puritans of the left gave a broader interpretation to 'things', substituted 'actions arising from conscience', and denied all human authority, ecclesiastical or civil, in religion.

This in brief, and with certain peculiarities which cannot be noted here, was the manner in which Milton developed the doctrine. Calvin's three parts of Christian liberty find their place in his writings, but are radically interpreted in defence of individual liberty especially as a consequence of his argument on divorce.

As Professor Woodhouse observes, the doctrine appears in *The Reason of Church Government*, though not with the consequences of 1659.² Because 'the Gospell is the end and fulfilling of the Law, our liberty also from the bondage of the Law', the argument that episcopal government is patterned on the Jewish is invalid.³ Because Christians are 'the heirs of liberty and grace', episcopacy is attacked as offensive to their 'admirable and heavenly privileges' as a 'royal priesthood'.⁴ I am unable to discover any heterodoxy in the inadequate theological reasoning by which Milton supports these arguments. What he says of the abrogation of the ceremonial law is perfectly consistent with Calvin's interpretation; what he says of the priesthood of believers is traceable (perhaps directly) to Luther. His arguments suggest the motives for his re-interpretation. Evidence of conscious re-interpretation is discoverable only in his argument for divorce.

The emphasis in the anti-episcopal tracts falls on the divine institution of 'one right discipline', in the divorce pamphlets on 'private' liberty. Christian liberty becomes of essential importance at this point because Milton's problem involves the exercise of personal freedom in opposition to ecclesiastical restraint, and because of the peculiar relationship between the Mosaic permission and Christ's statement to the Pharisees.⁵ Milton asserts repeatedly that his premises are received principles; and though this may represent self-deception, his belief must be taken into account. The theological premises of the first edition of *The Doctrine and Discipline* (August 1643) are in fact perfectly orthodox; what is heterodox is their application to divorce. But the extensive additions and revisions in the second edition (February 1643/4), and the rewriting of the argument in *Tetrachordon* (March 1645), show the movement of mind resulting in the

¹ *Op cit.*, p. 140.

² It is also suggested in the opening pages of *Of Reformation*.

³ *Works*, Columbia, III, p. 196.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 256-62.

⁵ Deut. xxiv, 1, 2; Matt. v, 31, 32. Other principles are of course involved in the divorce tracts, but I concern myself only with such arguments as bear directly on Christian liberty.

peculiar emphasis which gives Milton's interpretation of Christian liberty its heretical quality.¹

II

Two lines of attack on the received doctrine of divorce, bearing on Christian liberty, are present in the 1643 pamphlet. The first attempts to refute the accepted interpretation of Christ's statement on the ground that it must not contradict the Mosaic divorce law, the morality of which Christ could not have abrogated. In 1643 Milton argues that divorce cannot in itself be sinful, since the law is God's rule, revealed to indicate right, and so incapable of permitting sin (*Works*, III, 431, 471-2). Five major additions in 1644 buttress this contention (pp. 389-90, 434-43, 444-8, 463-5, 474-6), and also emphasize the correspondence of the law 'to right reason' (p. 440) and 'to the law of nature and of equity imprinted in us' (p. 445).

The new insistence on the eternal principles underlying the law also supports the second step in this argument. At least five times in 1643 Milton asserts that Christ cannot have repudiated the Mosaic permission because of the eternal morality which lay behind its inclusion in the law. 'The covenant of grace' cannot 'reform the exact and perfect law of works, eternal and immutable' (p. 468). The gospel cannot 'contradict the least point of morall religion...formerly commanded' (p. 414). It 'enjoyns no new morality' (p. 482), for Christ could abrogate only the part of the law relating specifically to the Jews, not the judicial and moral part resting on eternal principles (pp. 430-1, 466). Three additions in 1644 support this contention (pp. 388, 410, 485-6). In a fourth, Milton refers to Perkins who 'in a *Treatise of Conscience* grants that what in the judicial law is of common equity binds also the Christian' (p. 467). In a fifth he argues that the 'pupillage' of the law, discussed by Paraeus in his commentary on Corinthians, refers to the ceremonial part only (pp. 506-7).

Obviously the strength of this argument lies in its manipulation of the

¹ *The Judgment of Martin Bucer and Colasterion* add little in this respect. What follows is based on an examination of the British Museum copies of the 1643 edition (dated 1 August by Thomason) and the first 'revised and much augmented' edition of 1644 (dated 2 February by Thomason), though for convenience I refer to the Columbia edition of Milton's *Works*, in the notes of which will be found a record of the changes I mention. The Columbia editors refer to these editions as 1 and 2. They list one other state of the 1644 edition (3), and three states of an edition of 1645 (4, 5, 6). In substance 3, 4, 5 and 6 are identical with 2, though there are many variations in the title-pages and in spelling and punctuation with which I am not here concerned. I observe that the Columbia editors do not note a copy in the British Museum which consists of the text of 1 (without the two pages of addenda), the title-page of 2, and the new preface repeated in subsequent editions.

received opinion expressed in Article VII. To have weakened it at any point would have been unwise, since Milton is attempting to turn on the orthodox their own guns. In *Tetrachordon* (iv, 108-14, 138-41, 152-63) he repeats it exactly, though with little new matter; for 'much hath bin said formerly concerning this Law in the *Doctrine of Divorce*' (p. 108).

Though there is no change in this argument, the extent of the additions in 1644 indicates the liveliness of Milton's interest in the function of the law under the gospel. Moreover, his remarkable development of the second line of attack has a significant effect on his assertion that the moral law is still in force. This attack is based on the orthodox belief that the gospel is of faith, the law of works, and that by its very nature the gospel is more charitable and liberating than the rigorous and compulsive law. This includes the specific application of Christian liberty.

Milton considered divorce an indifferent thing, neither good nor evil in itself, but involving good or evil in particular circumstances upon which only the individual conscience can arrive at a conclusive determination. In 1643 this second line of attack receives less emphasis than the first. But he argues that, because all things are 'sanctified to a pure and Christian use' (iii, 407), Christian liberty in divorce must not be denied (pp. 412-13).¹ By reason of Christ's statement the orthodox regarded divorce as evil absolutely. The first line of attack disposes of this objection; and divorce is consequently placed in the category of indifferent things designated in Calvin's third part of Christian liberty.

Additions in 1644 mark a subtle but significant change in emphasis, for it is here that Milton begins to insist heavily on the contrast between the law and the gospel. The law is rigid and peremptory, the gospel tender (p. 428). Christians under liberty and grace are not to be more harshly dealt with than Jews under bondage (pp. 449-50). The gospel is not 'to impose new righteousness upon works, but to remit the old by faith without works' (p. 446).

Here again the premises are orthodox. They correspond with the emphasis on justification by faith in Calvin's first part of Christian liberty, and are at least suggested in 1643. But, as another long addition indicates (pp. 451-3), they are connected with the possible objection (here attached to Paraeus) that the gospel requires greater perfection than the law. Hence Milton's insistence on the gospel's charity—which is not only to be exercised by God but requires men to permit their fellows freedom in the solution of problems like divorce—and his pains to demonstrate that

¹ There are two other incidental references to Christian liberty in 1643, pp. 404-5, 508.

this exercise of individual choice is not a permission to sin but a necessary concession to man's natural and innocent weakness.

Several additions require close scrutiny at this point. In 1643 Milton replied to the argument that the gospel requires greater perfection by asserting that it is still the law which exacts obedience under the gospel, and, moreover, 'Wee find also by experience that the Spirit of God in the Gospel hath been alwaies more effectual in the illumination of our minds to the gift of faith, then in the moving of our wills to any excellence of vertue, either above the Jews or the Heathen' (p. 554). This statement introduces a ticklish theological problem, and is itself ambiguous. It is clearly connected with the idea that the gospel does not *require* a perfection higher than the unattainable standard set by the law to show the necessity of a redeemer; but it also implies that it does not *enable* the Christian to a greater degree of perfection than could be attained by the Jew and, what is even more significant, by the heathen. This is a curious opinion from one who had said, 'Love virtue, she alone is free', and whose writings on church and state are distinguished by a heavy emphasis on moral purity as the source of liberty.

In 1644 the entire passage in which this remark occurs is rewritten and the sentence dropped. Its place is taken by a careful distinction between sin and natural affections: 'I answer, This does not prove that the law therfore might give allowance to sinne more then the Gospel; and if it were no sin, wee know it the work of the Spirit to *mortifie our corrupt desires and evill concupiscence*; but not to root up our naturall affections and disaffections moving to and fro ev'n in wisest men upon just and necessary reasons which were the true ground of that *Mosaick* dispense, and is the utmost extent of our pleading. What is more or lesse perfect we dispute not, but what is sinne or no sinne. . . .' (pp. 451-2).

This revision has a bearing on a second important addition in 1644, the passage concerning Arminianism.¹ This occurs at the end of a long addition proving the law incapable of permitting sin (pp. 434-43). It is not necessary to the argument. Milton's purpose is to indicate that those who consider divorce evil make God the author of sin more certainly than does the doctrine of reprobation according to the Jesuits and Arminians. He does not accept the Arminian argument. He explains in the orthodox fashion that reprobation does not make God the author of sin, because man was created with perfect free will, and was therefore responsible for his own fall and the loss of free will, which was followed 'though not in time, yet in order to causes', by the decree of damnation which involves

¹ Sewall is mistaken in referring to this passage as in the 1643 edition (p. 48).

the punishment of sin with sin. But he clearly sees the force of the objection presented by those who 'perhaps out of a vigilant and wary conscience except against predestination' (p. 443); and his refutation is supported, not by the references to orthodox divines which one would expect, but by references (evidently culled from his private studies) to pagan philosophers and poets. I suggest that these references indicate a search for confirmation of the received opinion, and that this passage, taken with the deleted sentence of 1643, represents a perplexity on the condition of the will under grace which has arisen because of its significance for the divorce argument.

In the Arminian passage Milton indirectly draws attention to the fact that, in spite of his argument for freedom of divorce, he is not a 'free-willer'. He also unconsciously suggests that, if his divorce argument is incompatible with orthodox opinion, he will find it difficult to accept certain points of orthodox theology. For, as other 1644 additions indicate, his divorce argument was itself a demand for the free exercise of will and choice in a particular matter.

In 1643 he maintained that the magistrate could not 'interpose his jurisdictional power upon the inward and irremediable disposition of man' (pp. 500-1). In 1644 he emphasized the fact that no 'civil or earthly power' can hinder divorce 'against the will and consent of both parties or of the husband alone', that the law cannot judge but only 'the plaintiff himself' (pp. 498-500, 500-1, 503-4). The same point is made in the addition (pp. 505-8) in which he asserts with apparent orthodoxy that 'pupillage' applies to the ceremonial not the moral law. This insistence, at once on personal freedom and the continuance of the moral law, reminds one of Calvin's second part of Christian liberty—Christians do not obey the law under compulsion but voluntarily.

It is at this point that Milton begins to re-interpret the doctrine, for he here becomes involved in the question concerning the abrogation of the moral law of Moses along with the ceremonial and civil law. In *De Doctrina*, as Professor Sewell points out, he asserts roundly that 'the entire Mosaic law was abolished', and defends at length this departure from the orthodox opinion expressed in Article VII.¹ But he also insists that it was the Mosaic formulation of the moral law which was abrogated, not the eternal morality which it formulated. Under the gospel those eternal principles are 'written by the Spirit in the hearts of believers...'.²

¹ Sewell, *op. cit.*, p. 13 *et passim*; *Works*, xvi, p. 125.

² *Works*, xvi, p. 143. Cf. Woodhouse, *Milton, Puritanism and Liberty*, pp. 487-8.

This is the position to which he is making his way in the 1644 additions, and at which he arrives in *Tetrachordon*.

In 1645 he continues his first line of attack by insisting that the morality of the law is still in force; but he also insists on a Christian liberty more radical than Calvin's because that morality now finds its proper expression only in the individual Christian conscience.

But Christ having 'cancelled the handwriting of ordinances which was against us', Col. ii. 14, and interpreted the fulfilling of all through charity, hath in that respect set us over law, in the free custody of his love, and left us victorious under the guidance of his living Spirit, not under the dead letter; to follow that which most edifies, most aides and furdurs a religious life, makes us holiest and likest to his immortall Image, not that which makes us most conformable and captive to civill and subordinat precepts. . . (iv, p. 75)

He 'redeemed us to a state above prescriptions by dissolving *the whole law* into charity' (p. 76). His statement will be properly understood only if we 'compare and measure it by the rules of nature and eternall righteousness, which no writt'n law extinguishes, and the Gospel least of all' (p. 134).

For what can be more opposite and disparaging to the cov'nant of love, of freedom, & of our manhood in grace, then to bee made the yoking pedagogue of new severities, the scribe of syllables and rigid letters . . . If the law of Christ shall be writt'n in our hearts, as was promis'd to the Gospel, Jer. 31, how can this in the vulgar and superficial sense be a law of Christ, so farre from being writt'n in our hearts, that it injures and dissallows not only the free dictates of nature and morall law, but of charity also and religion in our hearts. Our Saviours doctrine is, that the end, and the fulfilling of every command is charity. . . (pp. 134-5).

I submit that these statements perfectly express the sense of Milton's interpretation of Christian liberty in *De Doctrina*, and that he arrived at this interpretation through his consideration of divorce. He began by thinking of divorce as an indifferent matter in which Christian liberty and choice might be exercised. Because of the peculiar nature of his problem and the orthodox criticism of his argument, he ended by asserting a Christian liberty which not only covers indifferent things but frees the individual Christian from the compulsion of *all* external precepts. The law in the heart is conscience, and conscience alone in a Christian governs the will. Moreover, 'the liberty we have in Christ' serves not only 'to deliver us from calamitous yokes', but 'to restore us in som competent measure to a right in every good thing both of this life, and the other' (p. 91). It is not merely 'a spiritual matter', it applies also to our earthly life; not only is it 'to be used in the presence of men', it frees the Christian from all external authority. There can be no 'crowding free consciences and Christian liberties into canons and precepts of men'¹—or of Moses.

¹ *Areopagitica*, Works, iv, pp. 341-2.

Between 1643 and 1645 Milton arrives at his radical interpretation of the doctrine. The way is then open for its application both to toleration and political theory. Such steps as he takes after 1645 will not develop his interpretation, for it can be developed no farther. They will merely formulate it more exactly. This deduction supports a belief to which I am led by an examination of the manuscript of *De Doctrina*, that Professor Sewell over-estimates the importance of the changes made in hands other than Picard's.

ARTHUR BARKER.

TORONTO.

WORDSWORTH'S DESICCATION

THAT entertaining tattler of the nineteenth century, Julian Charles Young, gives in his *Journal* a vivid picture of Wordsworth and Coleridge, whom, with Dora Wordsworth, he met at Godesberg on their tour up the Rhine in June 1828. Only the last anecdote will serve as a starting-point for this paper, but I am tempted to include for its freshness Young's account of his meeting with the two poets at the chateau of his friend Mrs Aders, as well as one or two subsequent comments by this shrewd young observer of twenty-two.

July 6, 1828. ...I had scarcely entered the saloon, and was trying to improve a bad sketch I had made the day before when an old gentleman entered, with a large quarto volume beneath his arm, whom I at once concluded to be of the anonymous gentry about whose personality had been so much mystery. As he entered, I rose and bowed. Whether he was conscious of my well-intentioned civility I cannot say, but at all events he did not return my salutation. He appeared pre-occupied with his own cogitations. I began to conjecture what manner of man he was. His general appearance would have led me to suppose him a dissenting minister. His hair was long, white, and neglected; his complexion was florid, his features were square, his eyes watery and hazy, his brow broad and massive, his build uncouth, his deportment grave and abstracted. He wore a white starchless neckcloth tied in a limp bow, and was dressed in a shabby suit of dusty black. His breeches were unbuttoned at the knee, his sturdy limbs were encased in stockings of lavender-coloured worsted, his feet were thrust into well-worn slippers, much trodden down at heel. In this ungainly attire he paced up and down, and down and up, and round and round a saloon sixty feet square, with head bent forward, and shoulders stooping, absently musing, and muttering to himself, and occasionally clutching to his side his ponderous tome, as if he feared it might be taken from him. I confess my young spirit chafed under the wearing quarter-deck monotony of his promenade, and, stung by the cool manner in which he ignored my presence, I was about to leave him in undisputed possession of the field, when I was diverted from my purpose by the entrance of another gentleman, whose kindly smile, and courteous recognition of my bow, encouraged me to keep my ground, and promised me some compensation for the slight put upon me by his precursor. He was dressed in a brown-holland blouse; he held in his left hand an alpenstock (on the top of which he had placed the broad-rimmed 'wide-awake' he had just taken off), and in his right a spring [sprig?] of apple-blossom overgrown with lichen. His cheeks were glowing with the effects of recent exercise. So noiseless had been his entry, that the peripatetic philosopher, whose back was turned to him at first, was unaware of his presence. But no sooner did he discover it than he shuffled up to him, grasped him by both hands, and backed him bodily into a neighbouring arm-chair. Having secured him safely there, he 'made assurance doubly sure', by hanging over him, so as to bar his escape, while he delivered his testimony on the fallacy of certain of Bishop Berkeley's propositions, in detecting which, he said, he had opened up a rich vein of original reflection. Not content with cursory criticism, he plunged profoundly into a metaphysical lecture, which, but for the opportune intrusion of our fair hostess and her young lady friend, might have lasted until dinner time. It was then, for the first time, I learned who the party consisted of; and I was introduced to Samuel Taylor Coleridge, William Wordsworth, and his daughter Dora.

...I observed that, as a rule, Wordsworth allowed Coleridge to have all the talk to himself; but once or twice Coleridge would succeed in entangling Wordsworth in a discussion on some abstract metaphysical question: when I would sit by, reverently

attending, and trying hard to look intelligent, though I did not feel so; for at such times a leaden stupor weighed down my faculties. I seemed as if I had been transported by two malignant geni into an atmosphere too rarified for me to live in. I was soaring, as it were, against my will, 'twixt heaven and the lower parts of the earth. Sometimes I was in pure aether—much oftener *in the clouds*. When, however, these potent spirits descended to a lower level, and deigned to treat of history or politics, theology or belles lettres, I breathed again; and, imbibing fresh ideas from them, felt invigorated.

I must say I never saw any manifestation of small jealousy between Coleridge and Wordsworth; which, considering the vanity possessed by each, I thought uncommonly to the credit of both. I am sure they entertained a thorough respect for each other's intellectual endowments.

Coleridge appeared to me a living refutation of Bacon's axiom, 'that a full man is never a ready man, nor the ready man the full one': for he was both a full man and a ready man.

Wordsworth was a single-minded man; with less imagination than Coleridge, but with a more harmonious judgment, and better balanced principles. Coleridge, conscious of his transcendent powers, rioted in a license of tongue which no man could tame.

Wordsworth, though he could discourse most eloquent music, was never unwilling to sit still in Coleridge's presence, yet could be as happy prattling with a child as in communing with a sage.

If Wordsworth condescended to converse with me, he spoke to me as if I were his equal in mind, and made me pleased and proud in consequence. If Coleridge held me by the button, for lack of fitter audience, he had a talent for making me feel *his* wisdom and my own stupidity: so that I was miserable and humiliated by the sense of it.

The account of Coleridge's conversations with Schlegel, and of Young's expedition with Wordsworth to the ruins of the old Cistercian abbey, Heisterbach, as well as the journalist's differentiation between the two poets in their attitude towards nature, cannot be included here. But the first of Young's two later anecdotes concerning Wordsworth shall be given.

It must not be assumed that the reciprocal admiration entertained by the two poets for each other's gifts made them blind to each other's infirmities. Wordsworth, in speaking of Coleridge, would admit, though most regretfully, the moral flaws in his character: for instance, his addiction to opium, his ungrateful conduct to Southey, and his neglect of his parental and conjugal obligations. Coleridge, on the other hand, forward as he was in defending Wordsworth from literary assailants, had evident pleasure in exposing his parsimony in the same breath in which he vaunted the purity and piety of his nature.

After the trio had left Godesberg, and were returning homewards *viâ* Amsterdam and Rotterdam, they paid a visit to Haarlem. Mrs Aders received a letter from Coleridge, dated from that place, in which he told her that they had not arrived many minutes at their hotel before one of the principal waiters of the establishment entered the room, and asked them if they would like to accompany a few other persons in the house to hear the celebrated organ played, as a party was then in the act of forming.

'Oh,' said Wordsworth, 'we meant to hear the organ' but why, Coleridge, should we go with strangers?' 'I beg your pardon,' interrupted the waiter, who understood and spoke English well, 'but it is not every one who is willing to pay twelve guilders (£1); and as the organist will never play privately for less, it is customary for persons to go in parties, and share the expense between them.' 'Ah, then, I think I will not go: I am tired,' said Wordsworth. 'Then you and I will go together, Dora,' answered Coleridge. Off they went, arm-in-arm, leaving Wordsworth behind them, reclining on a couch. They had not been long in the Church of St Bavon, listening to the different

stops which the organist was trying to display to the greatest advantage—the solo stops, the bell stops, the trumpet stop, the vox humana stop—before Coleridge was made sensible of the unwelcome intrusion of a strong current of air throughout the building. He turned his head to see the cause: and, to his amusement, descried his gentle friend, noiselessly closing the door, and furtively making his way behind one of the pillars, from whence he could hear without being seen, and thus escape payment. Before the organist had concluded his labours, Wordsworth had quietly withdrawn. On the return of his friend and his daughter, he asked them how they had enjoyed their visit to St Bavon, but said nothing of his own¹

The story of Wordsworth's niggardliness may or may not be vastly amusing, but it strikes me as vastly significant. I suggest that his poverty (especially in the decade after his marriage in 1802) burdened him more than has perhaps been realized—that it added to his self-absorption by cutting him off in these vital years from experience through travel and change of scenery and the stimulation of other minds, and that it may be considered, therefore, as one reason for his poetical desiccation. In what follows I purpose to treat the three matters just mentioned: (1) to review, however superficially, Wordsworth's financial difficulties and consequent domestic passivity; (2) to consider the old story of his growing self-absorption in his later life; and (3) to discuss the reasons for his withering as a poet.

1

Sir James Lowther's refusal to pay the debt due to John Wordsworth at his death in 1783 left the Wordsworth children to be supported by relatives, sympathetic or unsympathetic—only the legacy of Raisley Calvert in 1795 enabled William Wordsworth, at the age of twenty-five, to become a poet at all. Whereas Coleridge had dreamed of a Pantisocratic paradise in mosquitoless Susquehana, Wordsworth and Dorothy settled at Racedown, grimly living on vegetables from their own garden, and begging their friends not to send too heavy letters unfranked since the postage had to be paid at their end. Southey wrote to a friend in 1807, 'Drafts upon posterity will not pass for current expenses', and his greater contemporary might have said the same. Versifying, for more than twenty years, brought him in something less than seven pounds a year; at least in a letter of 1820 Wordsworth computes his returns from poetry—'I do not say *net profits*, but returns'—at £140. Henry Crabb Robinson notes in his *Diary* of 13 May 1812:

W. always tho[ught] that he was robbed of his just fame & consequently of his just emolument by the Edinb. Rev. & many years afterwds he told Serjt Talfourd that he

¹ I had thought that Young's account had been overlooked by students of Wordsworth, but I find that Miss Edith Batho quotes a passage dealing with Wordsworth's conversation in *The Later Wordsworth* (1933), p. 8. Her readable and scholarly book presents a thesis exactly opposite to that presented in this paper.

might say to his friend Mr Jeffrey that but for *him*, (J.), Wordsw. would have gone to Rome twenty years before he did.¹

The poet should have visited Rome thirty or forty years, rather than twenty years, before he did. (Perhaps, but for Napoleon's blockade, he might have done so.) He had been an incorrigible wanderer through his youth; he was an incorrigible wanderer in later life. But not until 1827 did the death of Sir George Beaumont give him £100 for a yearly tour, an invaluable dispensation had it only come a quarter of a century sooner. It was then, however, too late: the following passage in the *Diary* of Edward Vaughan Kenealy, May 1869, shows why:

Dined with Muloch, who talked as usual without ceasing. He mentioned having met Wordsworth and his sisters [sic] at Lausanne [probably in 1820]. He walked with Wordsworth, who had never been there before, and showed him the Castle of Chillon, 'the subject of Byron's beautiful poem'. 'Do you call that beautiful?' says Wordy. 'Why, it's nonsense. What means "Eternal Spirit of the chainless mind"?' Muloch said there was a very deep and very fine meaning in it. But Wordsworth flew into a rage, and from words they came almost to blows. And Muloch, instead of going back to breakfast with him, rushed off and left him.²

The advantages of travel in the early years are obvious in any consideration of Wordsworth Books 9, 10 and 11, the finest in *The Prelude*, grew out of his experiences in France in 1792. The Lucy poems and 'Lucy Gray', as English as anything he ever produced, were written in Germany in 1799. His Highland tour of 1803 gave expression to poems different from the Lake poetry, different in metre, different in subject-matter—the writer obviously feels the 'most poetic' environment of Scotland. But in 1802 came the marriage with Mary Hutchinson (did the curiously prosaic honeymoon, by the way, result so much from a lack of romance as from a lack of funds?), and with the unhappy procrastinations of Richard Wordsworth, with no stamp-distributorship until 1813, and with the blessing—and luxury—meanwhile of an anti-Malthusianly increasing family, the poet fell back more and more into domestic passivity. . . . Too, the masculine Wordsworth and the female Richardson had this in common: each was surrounded by a group of admiring females. Legouis has shown the dangers of even Dorothy's influence, stimulant that she was to her brother: her excessive susceptibility to the insignificant, her hero-worship that made her approbation sufficient to persuade the poet—who himself, as Walter Raleigh has admirably said, could never differ-

¹ Edith J. Morley, *Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Lamb, etc. being Selections from the Remains of Henry Crabb Robinson* (1922), p. 51. See also Wm. Knight's *The Life of William Wordsworth* (1889), III, p. 418. Wordsworth visited Rome with Henry Crabb Robinson in 1837.

² Arabella Kenealy, *Memoirs of Edward Vaughan Kenealy* (1908), p. 239. It may be objected that this anecdote comes almost fifty years after the event and is not well authenticated. Alas! it is typical of Wordsworth's later period.

entiate between a pearl and a pebble—certain that he had succeeded in producing successive masterpieces. Again, the death of John Wordsworth in 1805, of Tom and Catherine Wordsworth in 1812, must also have profoundly affected Wordsworth, sending him to the comfort of the stern daughter of the voice of God, duty, and of conventional religion. George Crabbe, who like Wordsworth wrote of the common people, must have felt his gloomy realism justified as the years went by, whereas his great contemporary of the Lakes must have felt his own optimism more and more tenuous, more and more isolating from real life, more and more consciously self-deceptive.

And so in 1818 we find 'Daddy Wordsworth' exhorting the Westmorlanders to vote for that noble nullity, Lord Lonsdale, when Brougham and Reform invaded the Lake District, just as we find him in the years that follow fearfully grumbling at Catholic emancipation, and frightened wellnigh spitless by the Reform Bill of 1832. Southey, likewise, similarly isolated and similarly mistaking lignification for a noble and philosophic detachment, Delphic-oracularly declared to England how she should be run, in the *Quarterly Review*. What both men needed, one cannot help exclaiming impatiently, was a dash of the whisky of real life in their Lake water. Wordsworth did not leave the poets just for a handful of silver (which, by the way, Browning always had); he left, partly at least, because he needed constant stimulation and lacked a handful of silver to obtain a change of scenery at the right time.

Brougham, in a satirical speech against Colonel Lowther in 1818, introduced an incidental side slap at Wordsworth, 'who happened to have risen from the extremest poverty to an affluence which he had no reason to expect'.¹ Succeeding years brought the poet financial security indeed, although not until 1842 did Peel confer upon him a pension from the Civil List of £300. Even when as poet laureate he was presented at Court in the year following, he borrowed his apparel for the occasion from the banker-poet Samuel Rogers, as Julian Charles Young notes in another anecdote. During these last years Wordsworth's fame brought five hundred strangers a season to Rydal Mount,² and a practical problem arose as to

¹ *Kendal Chronicle*, 4 July 1818.

² 'When I came into the district (in 1845), I was told that the average of utter strangers who visited Rydal Mount in the season was five hundred! Their visits were not the only penalty inflicted. Some of these gentry occasionally sent letters to the newspapers, containing their opinion of the old man's state of health or of intellect: and then, if a particularly intrusive lion-hunter got a surly reception, and wrote to a newspaper that Wordsworth's intellects were failing, there came letters of inquiry from all the family friends and acquaintances, whose affectionate solitudes had to be satisfied.' Harriet Martineau, *Autobiography* (1877), I, p. 509.

their entertainment. In 1845 Harriet Martineau became mistress of 'The Knoll', only about a mile and a half from Rydal. Wordsworth told her that she must make up her mind to be lionized.

People will come to see you [he said] though of course not so many as come to see me, whether you will or no; strangers, tourists, and all sorts; if they are such as you must entertain, give them tea; but if they want meat, let them go to the inn.¹

Such hard-headedness may be easily derided: Emerson, for example, considers 'that it evinced English pluck more than any anecdote I knew',² but to me it seems admirable common sense. Less than a hundred miles to the north, in Selkirk, Scotland, James Hogg had, a dozen years before, ruined himself in prodigal entertainment of unwanted visitors.

2

Miss Helen Darbishire, in the last of her brilliant lectures on Wordsworth which I once heard at Oxford, contrasts the obstinate, rash, and impulsive youth with the shrewd man settling down to domestic life, turning orthodox and sensible, surely and slowly improving his condition, meeting life, however prosaically, on the terms that life demands. A great American teacher, Frederick Erastus Pierce, whom I have had the privilege of listening to also, once said in the perhaps exaggerated ferment of a lecture that William Wordsworth was born with a one-sided intellect—a genius on one side of his brain, a blockhead on the other: a man of great natural powers, but at the same time of tactlessness and obstinacy that courted unpopularity. Professor Pierce compared, if I remember right, Wordsworth's blundering prefaces with Walter Scott's ingratiating, yet perfectly honest, introductions to the cantos of *Marmion*.

Happily modern scholarship has emphasized a different being from William Knight's and Christopher Wordsworth's poetic philosopher, perambulating about the Lake district in the later years blandly, and solemnly, and beatifically. There was a certain toughness in the gentle-

¹ Quoted from Miss Martineau's conversation with James Payn in 1862 James Payn, *Some Literary Recollections* (1884), p. 104.

² 'She [Miss Martineau] said that, on his early housekeeping at the cottage where he first lived, he was accustomed to offer his friends bread and plainest fare: if they wanted anything more, they must pay him for their board. It was the rule of the house. I replied, that it evinced English pluck more than any anecdote I knew': R. W. Emerson, *English Traits* (1857), p. 295. Possibly Emerson confuses Dove Cottage with Rydal Mount and 'friends' with 'visitors'. See the quotation given by James Payn, above.

Emerson has also this anecdote: 'A gentleman in the neighbourhood told the story of Walter Scott's staying once for a week with Wordsworth, and slipping out every day under pretence of a walk, to the Swan Inn, for a cold cut and porter, and one day passing with Wordsworth the inn, he was betrayed by the landlord's asking him if he had come for his porter.'

man. In early youth he tripped up his brother's heels when the latter was about to triumph over him in a footrace, at Cambridge he felt envy for a college mate who was his superior in learning Italian; he complained that *The Ancient Mariner* as much as the unfavourable reviews killed the *Lyrical Ballads*, he walked a visitor to the Lakes, an Eastern traveller who preferred the 'silent solitude of the Arabian Desert' to the 'bounding joyous, foaming streams' of the Lake district—'my mountain blood was up'—six hours, in his boots and great-coat, until he could barely totter. . . . Stiff, moody, violent, with what De Quincey calls a Roman austerity and harshness, Wordsworth was a burning poet first—only second a philosopher by self-control.

Yes, to this hour I cannot read a Tale
Of two brave vessels matched in deadly fight,
And fighting to the death, but I am pleased
More than a wise man ought to be; I wish,
Fret, burn, and struggle, and in soul am there.
But me hath Nature tamed, and bade me seek
For other agitations, or be calm. . . .

The Recluse, 1800.

Such a granite-covered volcano needed a French Revolution or a Coleridge for inspiration. Granting that such stimuli are a little infrequent, it needed the clash of minds, the invigoration of foreign scenes, the tumult of London at least: Hazlitt neatly summarizes the matter in his admirable designation of Wordsworth 'as one that would have had the wide circle of his humanities made still wider, and a good deal more pleasant, by dividing a little more of his time between his lakes in Westmorland and the hotels of the metropolis'.¹ You can't get sparks by striking granite with domestic passivity. You get instead an increasing pettiness, and parochialism, and self-absorption.

Examples of Wordsworth's growing self-absorption are legion. Take this occurrence at the house of Samuel Rogers:

One day, when Wordsworth was his guest, he was late for breakfast. Rogers went up to see how he was, and said to his guests, 'He dined last night at Sir Robert Harry Inglis', and the consequences are serious. I prevailed upon him to repeat one of his own sonnets. He is recovering prodigiously and will be here directly.'²

Compare, too, the difference between Wordsworth and Scott in their attitude towards one another. In a letter to Anna Seward of 10 April 1806 Scott refers to his visit to Cumberland of 1805, when he saw Wordsworth and Southey:

They are certainly men of very extraordinary powers, Wordsworth in particular is such a character as only exists in romance virtuous, simple, and unaffectedly restrict-

¹ *The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt* (1850), II, pp. 11-12.

² *Recollections of the Dean of Salisbury* (George David Boyle) (1895), p. 68.

ing every want & wish to the bounds of a very narrow income in order to enjoy the literary and poetical leisure which his happiness consists in. Were it not for the unfortunate idea of forming a New School of Poetry these men are calculated to give it a new impulse, but I think they sometimes lose their energy in trying to find not a better but a different path from what have been travelled by their predecessors....

One has only to compare Lockhart's account in his letters to his wife of Scott's visit to the Lakes in 1826 to realize Wordsworth's unconscious egotism.¹ Or take the Lake poet's opinion of his contemporary as quoted by Crabb Robinson in 1812:

13th May. A dinner with the Wordsws. at Serj Roughts...Walter Scott was mentioned. W. allowed him little merit, the secret of his popularity lying in the vulgarity of his conceptions which the million can at once comprehend.²

Or take another dinner of 21 May 1815, when John Taylor remarked that Scott's poetry was of a mechanical nature, 'and Wordsworth illustrated this by saying it was like a machine made to amuse children which turns round seeming to unravel something but to which there is no end. He said that in some of Scott's descriptions where there is much action to be expressed as in battles, etc. Scott has shown energy.'³ Such asperity justifies Byron's strictures in *Don Juan*:

Why then I'll swear as poet Wordy swore
(Because the world won't read him, always snarling)...

or Emerson's statement in 1848 that in London 'you will hear from different literary men, that Wordsworth had no personal friend, that he was not amiable, that he was parsimonious, etc. Landor, always generous, says, that he never praised anybody.'⁴

Yet it is only justice to emphasize Wordsworth's absolute honesty of opinion. The mother of Alaric Watts pays him the noble compliment of saying, 'He spoke always as though he were upon oath.'⁵ In June 1815 Bishop Wilberforce met the poet at the house of Sir George Beaumont. 'Dined at Sir George Beaumont's to meet Wordsworth, who very sensible, manly and full of knowledge, but independent almost to rudeness.'⁶ Of a period some ten years later Mrs Watts writes sympathetically:

Of his own poems he expressed himself with a confidence not unlikely to be misunderstood by strangers, whom he might not have had the opportunity of impressing, (as a very short conversation would ensure his doing), with the entire singleness and sincerity of his nature. He asked me what I thought the finest elegiac composition in the language; and, when I diffidently suggested 'Lycidas', he replied, 'You are not far

¹ Wordsworth struck Lockhart as 'proud and pompous and absurdly arrogant': see Scott's *Familiar Letters*, ed. Douglas (1894), II, pp. 340-43.

² Edith J. Morley, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

³ Joseph Farrington, *The Farrington Diary* (1928), VIII, p. 2.

⁴ *English Traits* (1857), pp. 295-6.

⁵ *Alaric Watts. A Narrative of his Life*, by his son A. A. Watts (1884), I, p. 241.

⁶ Quoted by Miss Elsie Smith, *An Estimate of William Wordsworth* (1932), p. 215.

wrong. It may, I think, be affirmed that Milton's "Lycidas", and my "Laodamia", are twin Immortals...'¹

Sometimes the older Wordsworth is irritating, sometimes he is pathetic, sometimes he is both together.

3

In a most stimulating book on the poet, *Wordsworth's Anti-Climax* (1935), Mr Willard L. Sperry considers successively the causes commonly assigned for Wordsworth's decline: (1) his premature aging; (2) his break with Coleridge; (3) his change of political affiliation; (4) his affair with Annette Vallon; (5) his intimidation by Francis Jeffrey. 'Any or all of them may have contributed to his impairment,' writes Mr Sperry. 'Of the causes considered thus far, the unexciting matter of his late literary arrival and his premature old age seems the most pertinent' (p. 122). But Mr Sperry emphasizes another possible explanation of the decline, the poet's reliance on 'The System'—his elaboration, that is, of a theory and his consequent 'dearth of...necessary subject-matter', the limitation of his 'supply of past experiences': 'It was, therefore, a risky venture which tied up Wordsworth's entire poetic capital with a single system of esthetics' (p. 123).

The limitation of the poet's 'supply of past experiences' seems to me as much due to his 'premature old age' as to his 'system', which, incidentally, was transient and experimental. Neither in style nor in subject-matter does 'the system', moreover, seem to me to account satisfactorily for the decline. Wordsworth has at least three styles: the early Popeian 'Evening Walk' and 'Descriptive Sketches', one; the *Lyrical Ballads*, two; the *Poems* of 1807, three. These poems of 1807 differ as much from the *Lyrical Ballads* as the *Lyrical Ballads* differ from the earlier pieces—they prove Wordsworth to have been a great experimenter in verse. The language of 'Yew Trees', for example, is as unlike as possible the language of the simple ballads: the syntax, word order, vocabulary are Miltonic. The style of 1807 has become literary, yet purged of artificiality: Wordsworth has outgrown artistic limitations—he has broadened both as regards diction and metre.² As for the themes or subject-matter of the later poetry, we may disregard the sonnets, the two great odes, the pieces

¹ Mrs Watts met Wordsworth in 1824 or 1825. The quotation comes from the notes she made for her son in later life: *Alaric Watts, etc.*, I, p. 240.

In a letter to Alaric Watts of 16 November 1824, Wordsworth 'strenuously recommends' an 'habitual perusal' of the great English poets. 'Shakespeare I need not name, nor Milton; but Chaucer and Spenser are apt to be overlooked. It is almost painful to think how far these surpass all others' (I, p. 200).

² These remarks on Wordsworth's style are simply a paraphrase of one of Miss Darbishire's lectures. Any errors are mine.

dealing with Scotland in the volume of 1807, and take a single poem, 'Laodamia' of 1814, which surely breaks sufficiently with any 'system'. If there are few such poems as 'Laodamia' in the later years, does the cause spring so much from a limitation of the author's 'supply of past experiences' as from a limitation of his supply of new experiences? The poet could have carried any system if only some sort of broadening had dissipated his premature old age.

Of the other suggested causes for decline, Annette has surely been grossly exaggerated by the Freudians. With Wordsworth's marriage to Mary Hutchinson in 1802 Annette faded out of the picture, except as a 'dadgummed' bother, completely. The death of John Wordsworth on 6 February 1805—occasioning as it did deep personal grief with the fear of public disgrace for the name of Wordsworth—'a deep distress hath humanized my Soul'—had a dozen times the importance of Annette.

Jeffrey and adverse criticism also, except as they actually affected Wordsworth's impecuniosity, can have had only a passing influence on his poetry. No doubt such criticism soured one who legitimately recognized his own genius, no doubt such criticism added to Wordsworth's defence mechanism of intellectual narcissism, no doubt such criticism even caused him to persevere doggedly with his 'system'. Hazlitt writes:

We are convinced, if he had been early a popular poet, he would have borne his honours meekly, and would have been a person of great *bonhomie* and frankness of disposition. But the sense of injustice and of undeserved ridicule sours the temper and narrows the views.¹

But it is well to remember that his complaint that *The Ancient Mariner* did as much as the unfavourable reviews to kill the *Lyrical Ballads* occurred before ever Jeffrey began his fustigation.

The reaction from the French Revolution can hardly be exaggerated. 'Poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings: it takes its origin from emotion recollected in tranquillity.' Obviously Wordsworth's memory was double-edged. The reverse of 'emotion recollected in tranquillity' as shown in 'Tintern Abbey', 'To Daffodils', 'The Highland Reaper', and other poems, is the emotion recollected in non-tranquillity, the horrors of the French Revolution:

Most melancholy at that time, O Friend!
Were my day-thoughts,—my nights were miserable;
Through months, through years, long after the last beat
Of these atrocities, the hour of sleep
To me came rarely charged with natural gifts,
Such ghastly visions had I of despair
And tyranny, and implements of death....

¹ Hazlitt on Wordsworth in *The Spirit of the Age*. A. R. Waller and Arnold Glover, *The Collected Works of William Hazlitt* (1902), iv, p. 278.

Such an indelible influence cannot be measured: the Terror occasioned the poet's swing from liberalism to conservatism. But why, other facts excluded, should conservatism mean poetical decline? Coleridge's magnetism and warm praise even for his friend's worst poetry might, if continued, have been a mighty influence. After hearing 'The Borderers' read in his visit of June 1796 to Racedown, Coleridge wrote Cottle:

I speak with heartfelt sincerity, and I think, unblinded judgment, when I tell you that I feel a little man by his side . . . His drama is absolutely wonderful . . . There are, in the piece, those profound touches of the human heart, which I find three or four times in the 'Robbers' of Schiller, and often in Shakespeare; but in Wordsworth there are no inequalities.¹

Such praise with the leavening of friendly flashes of lightning in the later years would have been invaluable. Yet the stimulation of new scenes and of new personalities, even if they could never have taken Coleridge's place exactly, might have sufficed to keep the smoldering soul of poetry alive.

To account for Wordsworth's decline may be, after all, largely guess-work. Perhaps the cause was purely physical, the result of trachoma or eye infection. Miss Edith Batho writes shrewdly:

. . . The decline in the volume of his poetic production was due, not to spiritual or moral causes, but to a heavy physical affliction which, beginning soon after 1800 at the latest, was hampering him well before 1815 and had crippled him by 1820: which we have yet been led to minimize or entirely ignore, partly by his own silent endurance, partly by the failure of his biographers to recognize its importance. . . .²

But of the 'spiritual or moral causes', female adulation, the influence of Sir George Beaumont (and possibly of Lord Lonsdale and Bishop Watson and other respectables), and above all domestic passivity and unhealthy isolation seem to me the best explanation for the poet's withering. I have not yet read Sir Herbert Grierson's book on Wordsworth and Milton. But the city-bred Milton, in contrast to the rustic Wordsworth, had the privilege of a Horton period without the need of a Raisley Calvert, and happily for him his revolution came not in his youth but in his later years.

ALAN LANG STROUT.

LUBBOCK, TEXAS, U.S.A.

¹ Joseph Cottle, *Reminiscences of S. T. Coleridge and Robert Southey* (1847), pp. 142-3.

² *The Later Wordsworth* (1933), p. 337.

CLAUDE FAUCHET AND ROMANCE STUDY

THE Renaissance is known in literary history as the time of the revival of the study of the ancient classics, and some of the monuments of erudition produced then have not since been equalled.¹ The Middle Ages, however, continued to exercise considerable influence on literature, as M. Henri Chamard² and others have pointed out. It is not now my intention to add any contribution to this study, nor to enumerate the works of Old French Literature known to such *chefs de file* as Henri Estienne,³ Estienne Pasquier and Claude Fauchet, nor yet to point out, after Ferdinand Brunot,⁴ that the sixteenth century did not study changes in sound, and therefore allowed guess-work to play too large a part in the etymologies it proposed. I wish to throw out a few more suggestions as to how Claude Fauchet must have come to write the first book of his *Recueil*.

The *Recueil* was published in 1581, but it had been a long time in coming to light. The very title is significant. A few chapters of it—those on the *Roman d'Alexandre*, the *Bible* of Guiot de Provins, and the *Roman de la Rose*—are to be found in their first form in the manuscript notes⁵ Fauchet wrote in 1555 at the age of twenty-five. Parts of other chapters appear to owe something to discussion.

Parisian Renaissance scholars delighted in argument. The young advocates in the Palais walked up and down discussing poetic inspiration, sometimes in the company of poets.⁶ Henri de Mesmes's library⁷ became a rendezvous for professors of the Collège Royal and magistrates of the Parlement or the Châtelet, and Henri Estienne mentions with evident delight the *pulcherrimae disputationes* that took place there. Printing-houses also served—Mamert Patisson's,⁸ for example—anywhere, in fact, where scholars could forgather, in a century that had not an established Academy.

Here are some parts of Book I of the *Recueil* where one can discover the echo of conversations.

¹ The *Thesaurus linguae graecae* of Henri Estienne, for example.

² *Les origines de la poésie française de la Renaissance*, Paris, 1920.

³ L. Clément, *Henri Estienne et son œuvre française*, Paris, 1899, p. 226; M. Moore, *Estienne Pasquier, historien de la poésie et de la langue françaises*, Poitiers, 1934, pp. 37 sq.; J. Espiner-Scott, *Claude Fauchet, sa vie, son œuvre*, Paris, 1938, pp. 141 sq.

⁴ *Histoire de la langue française*, Paris, 1905, tome Ier, p. 1.

⁵ Bibliothèque nationale, MS. fr. 24726.

⁶ Cf. *Les Dialogues de Loys Le Caron Parisien*, Paris, 1556.

⁷ Cf. *Mélanges Abel Lefranc*, Paris, 1936, p. 355.

⁸ R. Calderini, *J. Corbinelli et les érudits français*, Milan, 1914, p. 136.

(1) Where are the vestiges of the ancient tongue of Gaul (i.e. Celtic) to be found? (Chapter II.)

(2) What is the meaning of the word *roman*? (Chapters III and IV.)

(3) In what dialect were the *Serments de Strasbourg* and the *Chanson de Sainte Foy* written? (Chapters IV and VII.)

(4) Was the French language ever at any time in its history held in greater esteem than in the sixteenth century, and are the Italian language and literature more excellent than the French? (Chapter V.)

(1) TRACES OF CELTIC

Fauchet's general idea may be stated in his own words:

Il faut chercher l'ancienne langue Gauloise aux lieux esquels les Romains n'ont point esté.¹

The places in which the Gauls took refuge will be either mountains, the Alps or the Pyrenees, or marsh-lands, ancient Armorica or Holland and Belgium. He is careful to recall that Brittany was repopulated from Great Britain.

His mention of the Alps and especially of the Grisons is disturbing, and the question may be permitted: Did he think that Rheto-roman was Celtic? This is unlikely. Farther on in his book² he notes that the Swiss say 'Je sçay bien parler Roman' instead of 'Je sçay bien parler François', a statement that may refer either to Roumanche or to a Provençal dialect. Fauchet had also read Tschudi's *de Alpina Rhetia*,³ and he was certain to be acquainted with Conrad Gesner's work, *De differentiis linguarum*.⁴ Both of these affirm that Roumanche is a Romance language, or rather that it is *sermo Italicus corruptissimus*. In any case, Fauchet's actual knowledge of this language must have been confined to what he found in his reading and to what he could learn from travellers in Switzerland.

(2) THE MEANING OF 'ROMAN'

The 'langage romand' is thus defined by Fauchet in the *Recueil*:

Quant au langage duquel nos predecesseurs ont usé depuis que les Romains furent chassez de la Gaule, jusques au Roy Hue Capet... je croy qu'on le doit appeller Romand plustost que françois, puisque la plupart des parolles sont tirées du Latin. La longue seigneurie que les Romains eurent en ce pais y planta leur langue.⁵

¹ Cf. the edition of J. Espiner-Scott, p. 36.

² *Ibid.* p. 63.

³ Cf. J. Espiner-Scott, *Documents concernant la vie et les œuvres de Fauchet*, Paris, 1938, p. 228.

⁴ C. Gesner, *De differentiis linguarum*, in Schardius, *Historicum opus*, Bâle, 1574, p. 520. Corbinelli and Scaliger knew Gesner's work, therefore it is almost certain that Fauchet knew it.

⁵ Cf. Calderini, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

⁶ Livre Ier, ed. Espiner-Scott, p. 41.

In his *Antiquitez* he again refers to it in a passage with the date A.D. 609 in the margin, saying that about this time it is thought that the 'Latin and Roman' tongue began to be corrupted owing to the barbarian invasions. The use of Latin remained in the Church and in the law-courts, but 'with great corruption of its purity'. At the same time there came to be a marked difference between 'grammatical' Latin and the Latin of the common people:

dès lors en Italie appelé vulgaire Latin; et deça les monts, langue romaine ou romande, de laquelle usèrent tant les Gaulois François que les Espagnols ainsi que j'ay dit...¹ These clear precise statements contrast favourably with the gropings of much contemporary Italian erudition, but the best of the latter influenced Fauchet. The controversy² over the difference between romances and epic poems began in Italy in 1548 with the publication of Trissino's *Italia Liberata*, where the author in a dedication to Charles V accuses all poets who have not kept to unity of action of infringing the Aristotelian canon. The *Orlando Furioso* is censured. Naturally, Ariosto did not lack supporters, among whom were Giralaldi and Pigna. Speroni and Minturno took Trissino's part. Torquato Tasso entered the conflict, and tried to steer a middle course. Many contemporaries shared in the dispute and much ink was spilt on both sides.

The disputants generally tried with varying degrees of success to give the derivation of the word *romanzo*. Speroni, for example, whom Fauchet had met during his tour in Italy in 1551, had definite ideas which may be found stated in a letter of the year 1562, but which were probably in his possession before that date. *Romanzo*, he says, means not a literary work, but the language, not only the French vulgar tongue, but also Spanish, which gets the name of *romance castagliano*. He further opines that romances were first written in prose by the French and Spaniards, and were later turned into verse by the Italians, taking their name from the language.³

Giralaldi⁴ was of opinion that *romance* came from the Greek word *ῥώμη*, which means bravery; the romances were so called because the heroes gave proof of fortitude. Pigna⁴ thought that the Remensi had given their name to the poems, because Turpin, Bishop of Reims, who had written about knights and their exploits, had provided the poets with much of their material. Minturno⁴ was of Speroni's opinion; other contemporaries again wished to derive *romanzo* from *rhythmus*.

¹ Cf. *Œuvres*, Paris, 1610, f. 152.

² Cf. J. E. Spingarn, *Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, Fifth Impression, New York, 1925, p. 113.

³ Cf. Sp. Speroni, *Opere*, Venezia, 1740, v, p. 138.

⁴ Cf. *Recueil*, ed. Espiner-Scott, p. 67.

Direct proof of Fauchet's acquaintance with Italian thought is provided by his citing the names of both Giraldis and Pigna, but indirect proof is afforded by the notes and letters of his friend, Jacopo Corbinelli. The latter came to France in 1566, and in 1568 was one of the habitués of Henri de Mesmes's library,¹ where he probably met Fauchet. Corbinelli published Dante's *De vulgari eloquentia* and Boccaccio's *Corbaccio* in Paris. He was in his way a comparative philologist. He intended to translate Villehardouin into the language of the Trecento, taking Villani as his model. Fauchet acted as his tutor, and they read Villehardouin in a manuscript borrowed from Catherine de Médicis's library.² This argues a fair degree of intimacy. Corbinelli had occasion to define *romanzo* as early as 1569 in his note on *canzoni latine* in the *Corbaccio*.³ He repeats his definition in a letter to the learned G. V. Pinelli of Padua in September 1582:⁴

la lingua antica franzese—quella che risultava dal lor parlar latino corrotto che si faceva per la Francia, il qual parlar che si converse poi in vulgare, si chiamò *Romant*, cioè *Romant vulgare*, come noi per contrario diciamo *vulgare* per *vulgare romano*.

Pinelli in turn, when he made notes from his reading, expresses much the same ideas as we have found in Speroni. The French were the first to write romances, and the first to be written was *Lancelot du Lac*. Then came the Spanish with *Amadis*, and lastly the Italians, who took Charlemagne as their subject, and borrowed the word *romanzo* from the two other nations, who used it

in questa loro poesia in prosa per significare che erano scritti nella favella romano-spagnuola e nella favella romano-francese.⁵

Estienne Pasquier accused Fauchet of bringing forward an infinity of proofs for every assertion he made.⁶ For us, this is a merit, and it is precisely the merit of the fourth chapter of the *Recueil*, Book I: *Quelle estoit la langue appellée Romande*. Fauchet quotes examples of *roman* as opposed to Latin from the *Roman d'Alexandre*, of *enromancer* from *Dolopathos*, of *lingua romana rustica* and *lingua theotisca* as contrasted with Latin from an article of the Council of Tours, and better still, he cites the *Serments de Strasbourg* as an example of the 'langue Romaine rustique', advancing the opinion without stressing it that 'le parler

¹ Cf. Calderini, *op. cit.*, pp. 32, 38.

² Cf. V. Crescini, *Per gli studi romanzeschi*, Padua, 1892, p. 188, and J. Espinier-Scott, *Documents...*, p. 208.

³ Cf. *Il Corbaccio*, Paris, 1569, pp. 95, 164, and Corbinelli's additional notes at the beginning, unpagged.

⁴ Cf. V. Crescini, 'Lettere di J. Corbinelli', in *Giornale stor. lett. ital.* II (1883), p. 305.

⁵ Cf. T. Tasso, *Opere*, ed. Rosini, Pisa, 1828, xxiii, p. 117.

⁶ E. Pasquier, *Recherches*, Amsterdam, 1723, column 838.

roman fut plus particulier à Paris', and basing his assertion on a line from Clerc Simon's *Roman d'Alexandre*:

Li autre Erupeis & parla bien Romans.

Erupeis he interprets as *Hurepoix*. At the same time he is well aware that the Spaniards call their language 'Romance Castellano', and that the Swiss, as we have already noted, use the word *roman* for *français*.

(3) DIALECTS

The dialects Fauchet mentions are *Limousin*, *Wallon*, et *François*.¹ In the *Antiquitez*² he also alludes to *Auvergnat* and *Poitevin*. *Provençal*² he seems to consider as a variety of French, though there is no precise statement of his opinion on this point. He tries to tell us what Walloon is. The word 'wallon' is the same as 'gallon', that is, 'gaulois'. So much for the name. The dialect, according to Fauchet, is 'né depuis Charles le grand', and it has also been called *roman*, 'pource qu'il approchoit plus du Romain que du Thiois'.³

He seems to have known some of the peculiarities of the Picard dialect. In his notes on *Ciperis de Vigneaux*,⁴ he quotes a line:

Dont sonnerent le cloque qui bondi hautement,

remarking, 'Je devine que l'auteur fut Picard', and again in his quotations from the *Roman de Judas Machabée*,⁵ where occur the words 'commenche' and 'ekevins', he writes: 'Tous ces mots sentent leur Picard', adding that he cannot be absolutely certain because he has seen few manuscripts and no other works of the authors in question.

In another reference to Clerc Simon's *Roman d'Alexandre*⁶ he hazards a conjecture that it is written in Poitevin or Limousin. His manuscript of the poem has not been preserved, but it was evidently of the same family as the manuscript in the Arsenal Library, which has, as Paul Meyer⁷ said, all the characteristics of the dialect of Poitou.

Fauchet's surmise that the *Serments de Strasbourg*⁸ were written in the language spoken in his own day in Provence, Catalogne and Languedoc, and his further conjecture that the dialect of *Sainte Foy*⁹ is Old Spanish 'or at least Catalan', probably reflect a discussion in which a

¹ Cf. *Recueil*, ed. Espiner-Scott, p. 60.

² Cf. *Œuvres*, Paris, 1610, f. 331 v.

³ *Recueil*, ed. Espiner-Scott, p. 68; for *Walah*, F. Diez, *Grammaire des langues romanes*, 3^e édit. trad. par A. Brachet et G. Paris, I, p. 119.

⁴ *Recueil*, Livre II, Paris, 1581, pp. 115, 116.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

⁶ *Recueil*, ed. Espiner-Scott, p. 123.

⁷ *Alexandre le Grand dans la littérature française du moyen âge*, Paris, 1886, II, p. 103.

⁸ *Recueil*, ed. Espiner-Scott, p. 55.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

number of contemporary scholars all shared. This discussion had been going on for some years before the publication of the *Recueil*.

The starting-point seems to have been Italy, where interest in Provençal¹ had been rekindled early in the sixteenth century by commentators obliged to write notes on some of Dante's allusions, and more especially on Petrarch's summary list of Provençal poets in his *Trionfo d'Amore*, cap. iv.² In 1571 Pinelli enjoined Corbinelli to try to find some papers left by Castelvetro—another *provençalisant* and friend of the greatest of Italian Provençal scholars of the Renaissance, G. M. Barbieri.³ The reading of Jehan de Nostredame's collection of the lives of Provençal poets published in 1575⁴ seems to have stirred Pinelli's curiosity on one particular point. He wanted precise information on the difference between Provençal, Catalan, and Limousin, and made a note of his desire in an amusing fashion.⁵

(Cercare)

| | | |
|------------|----------------|--|
| za | { provenzale } | qual più vecchio |
| diff = del | { limosino } | et |
| | { catalano } | dove il presente è più lontano dal vecchio |

On 12 September 1579 he wrote to Claude Dupuy, who sent him a copy of Auzias March's poems, a gift from J.-J. Scaliger, and in his letter accompanying the gift, Dupuy writes:⁶

La langue limosine est une dialecte de la provençale...le langage cathelan est presque semblable à celui duquel usent ceux du bas Languedoc, qui est une autre dialecte de la langue provençale. Mais la limosine est la plus rude et grossière de toutes les dialectes de ceste langue.

Pinelli is astonished. If Limousin was as 'rozzo' as Dupuy said, how was it that all the poets enumerated by Nostredame had written in it? So he tried once more, writing this time to Corbinelli. The latter had recourse to Fauchet, who professed ignorance, due to lack of books written in these dialects:

Monsieur, vous presomez trop de mes forces, pensant que je sois suffisant pour monstrier la difference des langues provençale, limosine et catalane.⁷

In 1585 Pinelli was still searching. He again consulted Dupuy,⁸ who again gave him a reply similar to his first, to the effect that Limousin was 'aussi grossière et inepte entre les dialectes de la langue gasconne que la bergamesque en Italie'.

¹ Even before the sixteenth century, Chariteo, who was a Catalan, possessed manuscripts containing Provençal poetry. Cf. S. Debenedetti, *Gli studi provenzali nel Cinquecento*, Turin, 1911, pp. 14 sq.

² Cf. *Le volgari opere del Petrarca con la esposizione di A. Vellutello*, Venice, 1525, *Triumpho d'Amore*, cap. iv.

³ S. Debenedetti, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

⁴ Cf. the edition of C. Chabaneau et J. Anglade, Paris, 1913.

⁵ S. Debenedetti, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

⁶ Cf. V. Crescim, 'Lettere di J. Corbinelli', in *Giorn. stor. lett. ital.* II, p. 306.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 305.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 306.

We do not know whether he was ultimately satisfied, but the mention of Auzias March brings us back to Paris, to Fauchet, Corbinelli and Jean-Antoine de Baif. Baif and Corbinelli both possessed editions of the poet: Baif several editions in the original Catalan, a 1555 edition, a 1560 edition published by Claudi Bornat in Barcelona, Corbinelli Montemayor's translation published in Saragossa in 1562.¹ Baif sent Corbinelli his 1560 edition along with a couple of letters. Now the manuscript which Fauchet borrowed from Pierre Pithou in order to copy the two *lais* of *Sainte Foy* which he prints in the *Recueil* contains on its first page, apparently in Pithou's writing, a bibliographical reference to Claudi Bornat's edition with a mistaken date,² but one which we have already seen to be that of Montemayor's translation, 1562.

Pinelli's repeated questions, Baif's letters, the mistaken date all suggest that more than one scholar had a hand in Fauchet's conjecture on the language of *Sainte Foy*, in which, as the latest editor points out, he was a good deal nearer the truth than the philologists who have been interested in the poem since his day.³

To Claude Fauchet belongs the honour of being the first in the sixteenth century to appreciate the importance of the *Serments de Strasbourg*. It was he who drew Bodin's attention to them in Nithard's history, and Bodin very willingly acknowledged his debt to Fauchet. Bodin made no attempt to define what he calls, using the same term as Fauchet, the 'langue romande'. He translated the *Teudisca lingua* as *alleman*.⁴

Pierre Pithou, in his edition of Nithard⁵ a few years later, distinguished himself by the exactness of his reading of the manuscript, but did not explain what the two languages were. Fauchet is, therefore, alone in making the following surmise:

Or ne peut-on dire que la langue de ces sermens soit vrayement romaine (j'entens latine), mais plustost pareille à celle dont usent à present les Provençaux Cathalans ou ceux de Languedoc.

Or, as he put it later in his *Antiquitez*:

Je trouve que ce langage romand approche du Provençal ou Lyonnois plus que du nostre de deça Loyre.⁶

¹ Calderini, *op. cit.*, pp. 155, 157. Baif's letters are published by Calderini. A. Pagès edited the works of Auzias March, Barcelona, 1912.

² Cf. *La Chanson de Sainte Foy*, ed. E. Hoepffner, Strasbourg and Paris, 1926, I, p. 8.

³ Hoepffner's *Introduction*, p. 207, has established that the dialect is that which was spoken in the district between Narbonne and the Pyrenees, just on the borders of the Catalan district.

⁴ Cf. J. Bodin, *Les Six Livres de la République*, Paris, 1580, pp. 824, 825.

⁵ *Annalium...Scriptores*, Paris, 1588, II, p. 353.

⁶ *Œuvres*, Paris, 1610, f. 331r.

In his earlier conjecture, Fauchet is a predecessor of Raynouard. When he thought of the dialect as being that of Lyons, he is a predecessor of Suchier. The most recent editor, A. Tabachowitz,¹ gives a number of characteristics which attach the Serments to the *langue d'oïl*, and suggests that the dialect is that of Metz, but admits that had the text belonged to a later date, there would have been no doubt that Franco-Provençal, the dialect of Lyons, had everything in its favour.

(4) THE 'PRÉCELLENCE' OF FRENCH

Fauchet's fifth chapter,² which discusses the extent of territory over which French was spoken in the Middle Ages, and the conclusion to his seventh,³ where he says that the other nations of Europe invented rime in imitation of the French, must take their place in the history of Italian influence—'italianisme'—in sixteenth-century France. This influence, which affected manners, literature and language, made itself felt at the beginning of the century, was checked somewhat during the reign of Louis XII, but broke out again under François I and Henri II, flourished during the regency of Catherine de Médicis, and reached full ascendancy under Henri III.⁴ Opposition to the influence began in 1558 with Joachim du Bellay's satires on courtiers in his *Regrets*, but it was Henri Estienne who, by reason of his conservatism, patriotism, religious and political principles, together with his jealousy of the favour accorded at court to Italians, became its most vigorous and most celebrated opponent. For Estienne Italianism meant the pernicious spirit of intrigue that characterized certain courtiers; it meant also the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew, which was looked upon by him, as by other Protestants, as 'un crime italien'. In his letter to Henri de Mesmes accompanying the *Conformité du langage françois avec le grec* in 1565, Estienne refers with contempt to those Frenchmen who always wished 'se mettre en tout à l'école de l'Italie'. In his *Apologue pour Hérodote* he satirized Italian character, and his *Dialogues du nouveau françois italianisé*, which appeared early in 1578, give us an ironical picture of the courtier under Henri III. His *Précurrence du langage françois* (1579) placed the two languages, French and Italian, over against one another, Estienne seeking to show that French surpasses Italian in *gravité, douceur, grâce, brièveté* and *richesse*. He follows Bembo in giving long lists of Italian words which he says were derived from French; he also compares similar

¹ Uppsala, 1932.

² *Recueil*, ed. Espiner-Scott, p. 70.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

⁴ Cf. L. Clément, *op. cit.*, pp. 107 sq. Cf. also J. du Bellay, *Œuvres poétiques*, t. vi, p. 115 (S.T.F.M.).

passages from contemporary Italian and French prose and poetry. Petit de Julleville, in the *Introduction* to Edmond Huguet's edition¹ of the *Précurrence*, remarked on the absurdity of Estienne's assertions, and it is scarcely necessary to recall that the latter went the length of declaring that the Italians had taken a word like *testa*, for example, from French, because they ought, he argued, to have said *capo* from the Latin *caput*. Louis Clément² examined Bembo's list of words, noting that neither Bembo nor Henri Estienne understood that the same word might have existed both in Provençal and in Old Tuscan, without the one language being indebted to the other, and remarking that such Gallicisms—not nearly so numerous as is usually supposed—as do exist in writers who were acquainted with French, do not prevent Italian from having a separate existence as a language.

Fauchet's place in this question is a curious one. He evidently knew contemporary Italian treatises on the language and on poetry. His discussion is influenced by them, they stimulated him, but so far as the *précurrence* of French is concerned, he takes his stand by the side of Henri Estienne. Proof of this is seen in a letter sent by the traveller and diplomat, Filippo Pigafetta, to Pinelli in September 1582.³ Pigafetta relates how he has been translating Fauchet's *Recueil* into Italian, and revising his translation along with Fauchet. He goes on to give a provisional title to his work, where it may be noted that he intended to write several 'discorsi' about the 'favella che nacquero dalla latina'. He intends to sift the etymological question further and reply to Henri Estienne's *Précurrence*, asking help from Pinelli and from Sigonio, and saying:

bisognerà vedere nelle vecchie istorie i gradi del mutamento in Italia della lingua latina buona in questo linguaggio rustico cattivo, e, se guadagniamo questo punto, abbiamo vinto.

His intention is to begin a quarrel with 'these Frenchmen' which will be not unworthy of 'this century'. Everyone must be animated with the desire to discover the truth. He has already challenged President Fauchet, who has accepted the challenge 'a tutta oltranza'.

Pigafetta's vivacious tone contrasts with Fauchet's measured accents in the *Recueil*, but even there Fauchet's attitude is quite apparent. Fauchet must always have been a level-headed admirer of the Italians, because even while undergoing their influence he never forgot the past

¹ Paris, 1896.

² Cf. L. Clément, *op. cit.*, p. 218, note 5.

³ T. Tasso, *Opere*, ed. Rosini, xxiii, p. 96.

greatness of the French language, and it is noteworthy that the fifth chapter of the *Recueil* was to a large extent written in 1555.¹

This chapter originated in a discussion. Fauchet had been several times in company where it was said that the French language had never before in its history been held in such esteem. He, however, objected, saying that it was spoken by a far greater number of people in the Middle Ages, adducing a number of proofs, which he later gave in the printed form of the chapter. In this form he omits to give the origin of the chapter, but proceeds to recapitulate various facts about Latin in the Roman Empire, and to enumerate French conquests during the Middle Ages. Then he turns his attention to Italy, mentions the victory of Charles of Anjou, and the legend, which he appears to credit, that made Dante and Boccaccio both students of Paris University, declaring that the latter fact accounts for the large number of French words and phrases in Boccaccio's writings.

He then goes on to say that the words *rime*, *lai*, *sonnet* and *ballade* existed in French long before they did in Italian. The conclusion of the chapter has been modified in the *Recueil* to replace an allusion to the Ordinance of Villers-Cotterets and to the victories of Henri II by a reference to the 'augmentation' of poetry by the Pleiade, in which Fauchet likens their poems to the flowers of beautiful gardens, contrasting them with the thorns and briars of the wilderness haunted by his ancestors. In the past Italians, Spaniards and Germans all came to France for the peers and paladins of their epics, and Petrarch did not scorn to copy the lyrics of trouvères such as Thibaud de Champagne. They will therefore not hesitate to return when they become acquainted with the work of the excellent poets who have flourished since the reign of François I.

To what is said about Boccaccio in this chapter we must add various allusions in Book II.² There Fauchet seeks to show that the tales of the *Decameron* are not original, because similar stories exist in the *fabliaux* and in the *Seven Sages*.

Altogether, then, the debts of Italy to France are twofold. Petrarch and Boccaccio borrowed themes, and Boccaccio's language contains numerous Gallicisms. The titles of certain forms of verse have been taken over by Italian poetry.

Fauchet's assertions may be dismissed in a few words. Petrarch knew

¹ The 1555 version is published as an Appendix in J. Espiner-Scott's edition of *Recueil*, livre Ier.

² *Recueil*, 1581, pp. 106, 128.

Provençal, but not French.¹ Boccaccio may or may not have taken themes, the matter is of little importance, since he recasts whatever he borrows.² His Gallicisms seem to be facts, but his debts have been exaggerated by successors like Castiglione.³ *Ballade* is of Provençal origin, *sonnet* is a diminutive of the Provençal *son*, and took a different sense in Italian, *lai* is of Celtic origin—there only remains the word *rime*, which existed both in French and in Italian.⁴

This idea of the *précellence* of French occurs in another form in chapter VII, where Fauchet expresses the opinion that the French were the first nation in Europe to make use of rime and that they taught the others how to use it. The famous quotation from *Sainte Foy*, for which Fauchet seems to have been praised overmuch—philologists generally wishing to read into the fact of the quotation all the interest that they felt in the poem themselves—is made solely for the purpose of drawing from one line—

Qui ben la diz a lei Francesca

—the inference that ‘*lei francesca*’ means ‘*rime*’, and that therefore rime existed in French before it did in any other poetry. Of all the possible interpretations of the line, and they are legion, the one proposed by Fauchet seems to be the one that, in the opinion of Ernest Hoepffner,⁵ fails to find any support, because French poets appeared satisfied with assonance for a long time after the date of the writing of *Sainte Foy*.

In conclusion, then, the impression left on the student of the lives of the Renaissance scholars of the fifteen sixties, seventies and eighties is that these men were not isolated, but that Fauchet was undoubtedly in many respects a pioneer. Parts of Book I of the *Recueil*, such as the allusion to the Tower of Babel and to the first language spoken by men, may be completely out of date, and Fauchet’s information is vague on points that are rigidly precise for us. Moreover, he is wrong in some of his opinions, as when he accepts Pierre Pithou’s word for it that *druid* comes from *druhtin*, and that Chilperic’s additions were made to the Teutonic alphabet, or when he asserts that the dialect of the *Serments de Strasbourg* is Provençal, and that the French taught the other nations the use of rime, and that the Walloon dialect came into existence since the time of Charlemagne. But against these errors, none of which is shocking,

¹ *Recueil*, livre 1er, ed. Espiner-Scott, p. 81.

² Cf. *Le Roman du Castelain de Couci et de la dame de Fayel*, ed. M. Delboulle, S.A.T.F. 1936, *Introduction*, p. xli.

³ Cf. L. Clément, *op. cit.*, p. 219. I have been unable to find a book on the language of Boccaccio.

⁴ *Recueil*, ed. Espiner-Scott, p. 79.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, *Introduction*, pp. 226 sq.

there are numerous sound ideas. The reasons he alleges for the changes in language are the very reasons assigned by modern erudition. The words produced as *gaulons* are authentic Celtic words. He is convinced that French is a Romance language, and that the Church helped to propagate the use of Latin. He quotes the *Serments de Strasbourg*, and he states that the Carolingian court was bilingual. He saw that the multiplicity of dialects in medieval France was due to the importance and number of the courts of feudal barons. He even analysed the peculiarities of certain dialects. He correctly interpreted the term *roman*, and he knew that it was not confined to French. He was careful to distinguish between rhythm and rime.

In spite of the help he may have received from the conversation of contemporary scholars, merits such as those we have enumerated give Fauchet a place apart in the history of Romance study.

JANET G. ESPINER-SCOTT.

DALRY.

LE THÉÂTRE DE MME DE GENLIS

IL peut sembler étrange que la critique littéraire ait négligé presque complètement les six tomes qui composent le Théâtre de Mme de Genlis, œuvre qui lui a attiré des louanges universelles.¹ Son succès est attesté par l'enthousiasme d'écrivains tels que Buffon, La Harpe, d'Alembert et Marmontel;² son influence et sa diffusion se manifestent par de nombreuses traductions en divers pays d'Europe et aux Etats-Unis.

Il est indispensable, pour comprendre l'œuvre de notre auteur, de se rendre compte de certains aspects de sa vie et de son éducation. Mme de Genlis est née en 1746, dans une famille noble mais appauvrie. Quoique peu instruite dans son enfance, elle annonce sa vocation de pédagogue lorsqu'à l'âge de huit ans, déjà, elle fait assembler les enfants de son village pour leur enseigner l'orthographe et la diction. A Paris, peu après, où elle devait mener avec sa mère une vie de parasites, elle s'initie toute jeune à un monde suprêmement frivole et licencieux. Esprit précoce, elle ne tarde pas à s'y imprégner des préjugés de classe alors courants, à concevoir de grandioses ambitions, et à s'apercevoir, enfin, que pour une femme sans fortune, les seuls moyens de parvenir sont l'intrigue et l'art de plaire. Aussi apprend-elle la danse et la musique, mais surtout, elle se met, à peine adolescente, à jouer régulièrement des rôles dans les comédies de société et dans les tragédies qu'on faisait représenter.³ En attendant, son instruction reste négligée, mais sa jeune gouvernante, Mlle Mars, exerce, au moins sur un point, une influence décisive sur la formation de son caractère: elle lui inspire une étroite piété, qui lui fera mériter, par son opposition constante aux philosophes, le titre de 'mère de l'Eglise'. Ainsi, son goût pour la piété, pour la pédagogie et pour le théâtre s'explique par les influences formatrices de sa jeunesse.

Mariée, en 1763, au comte de Genlis, elle s'élève à la haute aristocratie, et ne tarde pas à briller à la Cour. Poussée sans cesse par une ambition

¹ Le *Théâtre d'éducation* parut en 1779, et le *Théâtre de société* en 1781, après avoir été représentés, à partir de 1776, sur beaucoup de scènes particulières. Seul le dernier a été remarqué par la critique (cf. Dubled, *La Comédie de société* (Paris, 1893), p. 236), alors que le premier est de beaucoup le plus intéressant. L'étude la plus complète de Mme de Genlis est celle de Jean Harmand (*Mme de Genlis*, Paris, 1912); malheureusement son œuvre littéraire, et surtout son Théâtre, y est négligée.

² Cf. Rostand, R., *La Vie amoureuse de Mme de Genlis* (Paris, 1927), pp. 100-1: 'L'Impératrice de Russie fait traduire tous ses ouvrages. L'électeur de Saxe lui écrit pour lui demander son amitié. On la compare à Fénelon, Buffon ne l'appelle que son adorable et noble fille; et tandis que Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, tiré à quatre épingles, ne déguise pas son amour éperdu, La Harpe ne lui laisse pas faire un geste sans le mettre en alexandrins.'

³ Chez Mme de Bellevaux, d'abord, et puis chez le fermier-général La Popelinière, de qui sa mère devint la maîtresse.

sans bornes, elle réussit par l'intrigue à entrer au Palais-Royal dans la suite de la duchesse de Chartres. Quelques mois après, elle est la maîtresse du duc (le futur Philippe Egalité), et jouit désormais d'un grand pouvoir sur lui. Au reste, elle ne se contente pas de diriger le duc de Chartres, elle se fait 'gouverneur' de sa fille et puis de son fils, et continue ainsi ses fonctions de pédagogue. Doit-on s'étonner si Mme de Genlis, ayant monté l'échelle de l'aristocratie du dernier rang jusqu'au premier, connaît ce monde aussi bien, ou mieux, peut-être, que tout autre écrivain? Nul doute que, douée d'une intelligence supérieure, d'un esprit de première force, elle saura contempler cette société d'un œil froidement observateur.¹

En considérant les deux *Théâtre* (d'ailleurs c'est le *Théâtre d'éducation* qui nous occupera surtout), notre attention est appelée à deux aspects de cette œuvre: à l'art dramatique et au tableau de la société brossé par une aristocrate.

La comédie de société est un genre qui alors faisait fureur depuis trente ans, et qui avait envahi à peu près tous les châteaux; et Mme de Genlis ne fait qu'imiter une mode universellement répandue. Tout le mérite du *Théâtre d'éducation*, au contraire, lui appartient. Personne, avant elle, n'avait écrit un théâtre à l'usage des enfants.² Croyant que les leçons doivent toujours plaire, elle avait la conviction que le théâtre serait un moyen d'instruction efficace.

Comme le *Théâtre d'éducation* est le résultat d'une inspiration originale, les procédés techniques de l'exécution se conforment aux idées particulières de l'auteur. L'intrigue est généralement mince, car elle cherche à éviter les passions violentes. Il n'y a pas de personnages vraiment vicieux. 'On n'a présenté que des défauts naissants, toujours accompagnés d'un bon cœur et par conséquent susceptibles de correction.'³ De plus, il n'y a jamais, sauf dans les pièces tirées de la Bible, des personnages des deux sexes. Mme de Genlis s'est fort bien tirée d'affaire, malgré les restrictions qu'elle s'est imposées pour accomplir ses visées d'éducatrice:

¹ Le reste de la vie de cette femme étonnante ne doit pas nous intéresser ici. Nous ne disons donc rien du rôle qu'elle jouera pendant la Révolution, de la vie pénible qu'elle mènera comme émigrée en Angleterre et en Allemagne, des efforts qu'elle fera pour gagner la faveur de Napoléon et de Louis XVIII. Elle consacre ses dernières années à composer ses *Mémoires*, le plus important de ses ouvrages. Elle meurt la nuit du 31 décembre 1830.

² La littérature enfantine moralisante, qui est la mode du temps, est abondante, mais le conte est le genre préféré (Marmontel, Mme le Prince de Beaumont sont les auteurs les plus connus). Au théâtre se répand le genre des 'proverbes', parmi lesquels il s'en trouve qui s'adressent aux enfants. (Cf. Carmonette, *Proverbes dramatiques*; Moissy, *Les Jeux de la petite Thalie* (1769); C. D. Brenner, 'Le Développement du proverbe dramatique en France et sa vogue au XVIII^e siècle', *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, xx, i, pp. 1-56).

³ *Théâtre d'éducation* (Bruxelles, 1840), I, p. 9.

pas d'amour, peu d'intrigue, des personnages moyens. Elle réussit généralement à trouver une situation qui, pour des enfants, du moins, ne manque pas d'intérêt. Surtout, elle a su y mettre du charme et une fantaisie délicate, ce qui explique l'attrait que possèdent ces petites pièces pour l'adulte qui les lit. La plupart d'entre elles se ressemblent. C'est d'ordinaire le même enfant vertueux et le même enfant méchant—le vice change, ainsi que la situation et les noms, mais le fond reste le même. Le méchant enfant ne suit pas l'exemple du vertueux; il fait du mal à quelqu'un qu'il aime, ou bien il risque de lui en faire, et alors il se repent. D'autres fois c'est un concours, où il paraît d'abord que la victoire va échapper à l'enfant vertueux, mais à la fin il triomphe et le méchant se repent inévitablement. Une troisième catégorie est celle où un prétendant vicieux, ou une prétendante vicieuse, est découvert et refusé. Tout fade que cela nous paraisse, il faut admettre que ce sont justement de telles intrigues qui plaisent à l'esprit naif d'un enfant, que doivent absorber les péripéties du triomphe du bien sur le mal.

Les comédies vraiment originales de Mme de Genlis sont précédées de sept autres tirées de la Bible. De l'épisode d'Isaac elle fait l'histoire d'un enfant parfait qui ne songe en toute chose qu'au bonheur de ses parents.¹ Dans la *Veuve de Sarepta* Mme de Genlis nous fait une leçon contre le luxe et la magnificence, vante les biens de la nature et de la vie rustique. La meilleure des pièces bibliques est sans doute la *Mort d'Adam*. On prépare le mariage des petits-fils d'Adam, lorsque Dieu lui fait annoncer sa mort prochaine. L'émotion dramatique grandit quand Caïn arrive et maudit son père. Adam souffre d'avoir à mourir, d'abord parce qu'il est né pour l'immortalité et puis parce qu'il craint que ses fils ne le maudissent quand viendra leur tour de mourir. Mme de Genlis fait une part plus grande à ses tourments moraux que Klopstock, de qui elle a imité *Der Tod Adams*; mais elle gâte sa pièce par les leçons de morale qui viennent à tout propos. A un certain moment dramatique, par exemple, où Adam va creuser son propre tombeau, il s'interrompt pour discourir sur l'utilité de la bêche!²

Parmi les comédies originales, les *Flacons* sont une des plus charmantes. Il s'agit de deux sœurs vaniteuses, à qui une fée fait croire qu'elle les a rendues laides. La mère aussi prétend d'abord ne pas les reconnaître, mais elle leur dit qu'elle les aimera tout autant. Quand la fée pense que les sœurs sont guéries, elle leur donne, pour les éprouver, deux flacons: l'un fera disparaître leur laideur, l'autre leur donnera toutes les qualités

¹ La pièce de Mme de Genlis est imitée de l'*Isacco, figura del Redentore* (1740) de Métastase.
² II, ii.

du cœur et de l'esprit. D'abord elles voudraient choisir le premier, mais après avoir pensé au chagrin de leur mère, elles choisissent l'autre : bien entendu, la récompense c'est de redevenir belles aussi. A vrai dire la conclusion n'est pas satisfaisante, puisqu'au fond elles préfèrent encore la beauté—mais peut-être est-elle plus vraie.

Du peu que nous en avons dit, on aura déjà conclu que le *Théâtre d'éducation* est bourré de sentences morales. On pourrait presque dire qu'on en trouve à chaque page. Souvent l'action est interrompue par de longs discours oratoires et affectés. Il serait inutile de faire la liste de toutes les vertus que prêche Mme de Genlis—la charité, l'amour de la vie rurale par opposition à la vie corrompue de Paris et de la Cour, la modestie, le sérieux, la modération au lieu du luxe—tout cela basé sur la religion. La vertu qu'elle enseigne par-dessus toutes les autres, c'est l'affection familiale, l'amour maternel, fraternel, filial.

On pourrait presque dire que le *Théâtre de société* n'est qu'un autre théâtre 'd'éducation', adressé, cette fois, aux parents des enfants pour qui l'auteur avait écrit d'abord. Toute l'œuvre de Mme de Genlis est celle d'une moraliste, et quel que soit le sujet qu'elle traite, quel que soit le genre dans lequel elle s'exprime, elle ne perd jamais le souci d'enseigner la morale. Elle continuera donc à montrer le vice déjoué et la vertu triomphante.

Cependant, la plupart des comédies du *Théâtre de société* sont légères, superficielles, follement romanesques ; car le but de l'auteur est d'enseigner en amusant, mais surtout d'amuser. Et, à un certain degré, elle y réussit. Le *Théâtre de société* nous donne des intrigues mieux développées et plus mouvementées que le *Théâtre d'éducation* ; le style aussi est plus naturel et parfois spirituel. Au demeurant, il ne faut pas oublier, en parlant des qualités de ces comédies, comme en parlant de leurs défauts, que Mme de Genlis écrit pour un genre quasi-fixe. La légèreté élégante et superficielle, l'importance accordée à l'intrigue et, dans celle-ci, à l'artifice, tiennent du genre. On pourrait peut-être, par esprit d'indulgence, mettre sur le même compte la puérilité des sujets et des intrigues. Mais c'est à Mme de Genlis seule qu'incombe leur parfaite monotonie. Comme dans le *Théâtre d'éducation*, ses comédies se ressemblent toutes. Il s'agit toujours des manèges qu'emploie l'amant rejeté (soit par l'objet de sa passion, soit par ses parents) pour obtenir la main de celle qu'il aime, et il ne manque jamais d'y réussir. Bien entendu, il y a aussi le méchant rival, qui est toujours repoussé à la fin. Tout monotone que cela paraisse, il faut quand même admettre que l'auteur trouve quelquefois une situation assez amusante. A deux égards, seulement, Mme de Genlis ne se

conforme pas aux usages qu'ont suivis les autres écrivains pour le théâtre de société, notamment Collé et Fagan. chez ceux-ci, on remarque souvent une intention franchement satirique, et rarement une intention moralisatrice; d'autre part, la comédie de société a une tradition licencieuse que Mme de Genlis, pieuse 'mère de l'Eglise', a nettement rejetée. Mais ces deux traits—fort importants, d'ailleurs—mis à part, le *Théâtre de société* reflète fidèlement le goût de son époque.

La meilleure pièce du *Théâtre de société* est sans doute la *Mère rivale*. C'est la seule où l'intérêt dramatique soit saisissant, la seule où il y ait un vrai problème psychologique qui nous intéresse. En voici un résumé très simplifié:

Célanie, veuve et mère dévouée, et Aglae, sa fille, sont toutes deux amoureuses du chevalier de Valcourt. Celui-ci, après avoir longtemps courtsié Célanie, aime à présent sa fille. Mélite, intrigante jalouse, surprend l'amour d'Aglae, l'apprend au chevalier et promet faussement de les aider. Aglae, embarrassée par la révélation de son amour, consent contre son gré à garder le secret.

Les projets de Célanie sont bouleversés lorsque le chevalier repousse, tout en refusant de s'expliquer, son offre de mariage, et lorsqu'Aglae ne consent pas à épouser le marquis d'Hercy, que lui destine sa mère. La perfide Mélite profite de l'agitation de Célanie et lui découvre le secret, feignant de la croire instruite. La mère, blessée et furieuse à la fois, accuse sa fille d'ingratitude et de haine. Elle promet de la marier au chevalier, mais s'en ira à tout jamais; comme c'est Mélite qu'Aglae a choisie pour confidente, Célanie donne à celle-ci tous ses droits de mère.

Le marquis d'Hercy entreprend de réparer la situation. Il offre sa main à Mélite et détermine le chevalier à écrire un billet dans lequel il renonce à Aglae afin de montrer son amitié pour Célanie. Aglae, ayant vu le billet, consent à épouser le marquis, et écrit au chevalier qu'elle se sacrifie pour prouver à sa mère 'qu'elle a mal connu son cœur'. Le marquis réunit les trois femmes, et Célanie est persuadée de la sincérité de sa fille et de la fausseté de Mélite. La pièce se termine par une réconciliation universelle.

L'action est compliquée, rapide, bien menée; mais elle nous intéresse moins que la situation, qui nous présente la mère et la fille amoureuses du même homme. Les faiblesses de notre auteur s'y laissent voir. Elle aurait pu étudier à fond le cœur de Célanie, déchiré par trois émotions qu'elle n'a fait qu'indiquer: l'humiliation d'avoir été refusée par le chevalier après sa déclaration passionnée, et deux différents sentiments de jalousie—celui d'une mère qui croit que sa fille a plus de confiance en sa tante qu'en elle, et celui d'une femme amoureuse à qui l'on en préfère une autre. Ces trois émotions permettraient une étude psychologique très poussée. Au lieu d'une pièce profonde et émouvante, Mme de Genlis a fait une comédie ingénieuse. C'est la nature du genre, répliquera-t-on, elle ne veut faire qu'une comédie de société. Mais les comédies de société sont aujourd'hui toutes oubliées, et pour la même raison de superficialité, pour le manque de vérité humaine.

Mme de Genlis n'est donc pas capable de mener à bien l'étude des émotions et du caractère humain. Elle n'a créé que des caractères d'une

simplicité élémentaire, bons ou méchants, tout d'une pièce. Ses petites filles et ses jeunes filles ne sont pas complètement dépourvues de charme, mais ses hommes sont de bois.

Cependant, s'il ne faut pas demander à Mme de Genlis de 'mettre en relief les contrastes puissants du vice et de la vertu, les ressorts cachés de la nature et des passions', elle excelle, en revanche, à 'pénétrer les petits intérêts qui agitent la société, les nuances fugitives des modes'.¹

La qualité la plus précieuse de son théâtre c'est effectivement d'avoir traduit fidèlement la vie et les coutumes, les vices et les vertus de l'époque qui termine l'ancien régime. Mme de Genlis nous a laissé des esquisses de la vie autour d'elle, des croquis très délicats et vivants.² En lisant ces pièces, on voit toute l'artificialité de la société de cette époque. On la voit surtout dans le manque total de vie de famille; dans la séparation des enfants de leur mère; dans la coutume de les confier à une gouvernante qui ne cherche qu'à les flatter et qu'à les gâter pour en tirer plus tard son profit.³ On la retrouve dans leur éducation, qui ne vise qu'à les préparer à briller dans les salons, qui étouffe les instincts enfantins naturels, et à laquelle Mme de Genlis, disciple de Rousseau, s'oppose vigoureusement.⁴ C'est une éducation qui les préparait à l'égoïsme, à une singerie perpétuelle des modes, à une sensibilité fausse et hypocrite. Tout jeunes, les enfants apprennent à mépriser les classes inférieures, à se considérer comme des êtres un peu différents et de beaucoup supérieurs; tout jeunes, ils ont des domestiques personnels qu'ils commandent à leur gré et qui les flagornent et les gâtent.

Les résultats de ce système se voient dans les salons, où l'artificiel atteint son plus haut point—les visites mondaines, la flatterie hypocrite, par exemple. Mme de Genlis nous a laissé un portrait en pied de la femme mondaine; elle se distingue par sa frivolité, sa sensibilité exagérée, sa passion de la bienfaisance et par sa prétention à connaissances philosophiques et scientifiques.⁵ Mme de Genlis fait parler ces femmes comme

¹ Dubled, *op. cit.*, pp. 297-8.

² 'L'on y trouve un je ne sais quoi de féminin, fait d'habitude et de tact du monde, qui manque aux meilleurs moralistes du temps, à Grimm, à Marmontel, au duc de Lévis. On peut le dire en toute vérité mieux que personne, elle a su rendre son époque avec des couleurs vraies; elle a pris son siècle sur le fait, et Brifaut n'a pas si grand tort d'affirmer que, comparés aux siens, les romans de Crébillon fils, Diderot, Voisinon, Duclos, Laclos, donnent la sensation d'enseignes de cabaret à côté de tableaux de famille' (Dubled, *La Société française du XVIIe au XXe siècles*, 7^e série, p. 222).

³ *L'Enfant gâté*.

⁴ *La Colombe*, etc.

⁵ Cf. *La Bonne mère*, *Les Ennemies dangereuses*, *Les Dangers du monde*. La vicomtesse, dans cette dernière pièce, suit des cours de physique et de chimie, parce que 'ce genre d'études est très à la mode'. Elle manque les leçons, 'n'apprend rien, ne sait rien, parle de tout, décide impérieusement, en impose quelquefois aux sots et fait pitié aux gens raisonnables' (I, II, III, VI).

elle les a entendu parler autour d'elle; elle expose leur superficialité et leur snobisme.

Notre auteur attaque aussi d'autres vices des mœurs contemporaines: les intrigantes dont Paris était plein; le duel; la coutume d'enlever une paysanne, d'en faire sa maîtresse et de la faire entrer à l'Opéra pour la mettre à l'abri de ses parents; les couvents, but de nombreuses attaques au cours du siècle.¹

Cependant Mme de Genlis n'écrit pas pour faire la satire de son époque: elle fait œuvre de moraliste et de réformatrice. Elle ne cherche, au fond, qu'à perpétuer la civilisation et la société telles qu'elles étaient alors. Or, la société de l'ancien régime reposait en partie sur le système de mariage alors courant. Mme de Genlis fait donc sans cesse la défense de ce système dans ses pièces. Partout, le mariage d'amour, la mésalliance et le déclassement sont condamnés; partout, l'obéissance absolue est enseignée comme la plus grande vertu que l'enfant puisse avoir—et surtout par rapport au mariage.² Bien entendu, elle préfère passer sous silence les effets néfastes de ce système, l'immoralité, la licence et le manque de vie de famille qui en résultaient.

On retrouve dans le *Théâtre d'éducation* toutes les classes: le paysan, le bourgeois et le gentilhomme. Il faut signaler le portrait que nous donne Mme de Genlis de la lingère, de la marchande de modes, du magistrat. Ce sont des portraits pris sur le vif; en nous faisant voir à la fois des gens typiques et des intérieurs intimes et réels ils récréent pour nous toute l'atmosphère du XVIII^e siècle.

Dans la *Rosière de Salency*, on aperçoit les relations familières entre la noblesse champêtre et les paysans, et leur promptitude à se mêler aux fêtes populaires. Cette comédie nous représente la vieille coutume picarde, très accueillie par les âmes sensibles de cette époque, de couronner chaque année par un chapeau de roses la plus vertueuse fille du village. Mais l'attitude de la noblesse de campagne envers les paysans fait contraste avec celle de la noblesse de ville et de cour envers la bourgeoisie. Pour le bourgeois, l'aristocrate n'avait que de la morgue et du mépris. Deux des comédies écrites pour la bourgeoisie nous permettent de voir d'une manière concrète et saisissante ces distinctions et ces préjugés de classe.³ Mme de Genlis les défend: c'est un autre appui du régime qu'elle veut conserver.⁴

¹ *L'Intrigante*, *Les Faux-amis*, *Cécile ou le sacrifice de l'amitié*, etc.

² Cf. *Le Magistrat*, *La Belle et la bête*, *La Bonne mère*, *Vathek*, etc.

³ *Le Vrai sage*, *La Lingère*.

⁴ Ophéon, dans *Le Vrai sage*, conseille à son fils de toujours 'respecter les distinctions établies dans la société: c'est l'orgueil plutôt que la philosophie qui les dédaigne; le vrai sage les reconnaît toutes, il est ami de l'ordre, l'observateur exact des bienséances. et jamais il ne

Plusieurs idées générales se dégagent de cette analyse rapide. Le *Théâtre d'éducation* et le *Théâtre de société*, destinés chacun à un public différent, se ressemblent par leurs faiblesses : leur auteur n'a pas le talent de créer des personnages réels ; dans la construction de ses pièces, elle suit toujours deux ou trois formules sans guère les varier. Le *Théâtre de société* l'emporte par l'intérêt des intrigues, qui sont, d'après la nature du genre, rapides et très compliquées ; le dialogue, aussi, est plus spirituel. En revanche, le succès éclatant du *Théâtre d'éducation* ne s'explique pas seulement par son originalité : Mme de Genlis a mis dans ces petites comédies une fantaisie charmante qui a dû à la fois faire les délices des enfants, et faire respirer aux adultes le parfum de leur enfance passée. Il est vrai qu'elles sont quelque peu gâtées pour l'adulte par les leçons de morale qu'on y rencontre à tout point et qui viennent parfois assez mal à propos. N'oublions pas que le *Théâtre d'éducation* s'adresse aux enfants ; en se mettant à leur place on voit que la morale est enseignée de façon à ne pas nuire à l'intérêt. Comme peintre de mœurs, enfin, notre auteur vaut plus que comme écrivain dramatique : nous venons de voir que son époque revit dans ses comédies.

Malgré son immense popularité, qui s'est étendue à travers plusieurs pays et qui a survécu à celle de ses romans, le théâtre de Mme de Genlis est tombé dans un oubli complet. Il lui a manqué, tout d'abord, le don essentiel que doit posséder tout auteur dramatique : l'art d'infuser dans ses personnages le souffle de la vie. Sans doute il faut chercher une autre cause de cet oubli dans le fait même, que ses pièces sont attachées intimement aux mœurs et aux conditions de l'époque où elles furent composées. Ce n'est pas uniquement la surabondance de sentences morales qui nuit à leur intérêt, c'est la morale elle-même qui est vieillie. Mme de Genlis n'a pas su atteindre, à travers les formes éphémères qu'elle revêt à un moment donné, ce qu'il y a de permanent dans la nature humaine. La langue, les idées, les sentiments reflètent fidèlement la vie contemporaine de leur auteur, mais il manque à celle-ci cette profondeur qui, avec la beauté de la forme, est le seul garant de la gloire posthume.

LESTER GILBERT KRAKEUR.

FLUSHING, N.Y.

paraîtra mépriser les droits de la naissance et du rang' (Scène II) Mme de Genlis n'hésite pas à avouer que la supériorité de naissance n'est qu'une convention, et que la seule véritable supériorité vient de l'éducation et des talents. Mais l'éducation doit être différente pour chaque classe. Le jeune bourgeois apprendra qu'il doit toujours s'incliner devant le gentilhomme, et celui-ci apprendra dès son enfance que ce respect lui est dû naturellement. Ainsi les préjugés de classe ne seront jamais effacés.

HERDER'S APPROACH TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

Sobald ich aber nun gar Ursache und Folge entwickle, so bin ich nicht mehr Geschichtsschreiber, sondern Philosoph, Staatsmann, Prophet oder wie mans nenne, und ziehe ich diesen Faden gar über Zeiten und Völker, so bin ich fast nicht mehr Mensch, sondern ein hoher Geschopf, das aus den Wolken den Lauf der Dinge nachspure¹

THERE is ample evidence, in Herder's Riga works, of a well-marked interest in the philosophy of history, although in these early years it lacked direction and cohesion. During and after the sea-journey of 1769 this interest leapt with peculiar vigour into the very forefront of Herder's thought and elbowed all else into a subsidiary position. The passage in the *Reisejournal*, where a 'Universalgeschichte der Bildung der Welt' is planned,² is well known. What is less clearly realized is that it was necessary for Herder's plan to pass through several important phases before it could be put into execution.

As a young man of twenty-five, with little more—outwardly at least—than the reputation of being a good preacher and, in some circles, a promising critic of literature, he set himself a task that can hardly ever have been equalled for the magnitude of its conception and implications. The surprising thing is that barely four years were to elapse before he felt himself able to attempt to carry it out. And this is the more remarkable when it is remembered that Herder was never a man who dominated his thought by virtue of a strong will; he was rather dominated by it, swayed this way and that by new impressions and ideas.

How, then, did he reach such a position at all? By what stages did he move from literary and linguistic criticism, which occupied most of the first ten years of his authorship, to the thought of *Auch Eine Philosophie der Geschichte*? The answer to this question is not readily found. In the major biographies it is swamped in the welter of facts on this, the most perplexing phase of Herder's career. Smaller monographs, in particular those on theological points, contain hints of varying import-

¹ Herder, *Samtliche Werke*, hrsg. von B. Suphan (henceforth referred to as *SWS*), VIII, p. 466, n. 1.

² *SWS*, IV, p. 353.

ance¹ A gathering together of these hints into some sort of perspective seems to be necessary, in order that the explanation of this metamorphosis in Herder's thought may emerge into some sort of clarity.

On the personal side, it is necessary to recall the peculiar restlessness of the years after Herder's departure from Riga. All the time he lived under the stress of violent emotion. He had started on his wanderings with a grudge against the world for having been denied the chance of a life of action. The experiences and sufferings of his journey, as well as the anguish of his life in Bückeberg, strengthened his grudge and consumed his patience. In such circumstances clarity and coherence are the last things to look for. His marriage, to be sure, gave a fresh impetus to Herder's authorship, and the autumn of 1773—when *Auch Eine Philosophie der Geschichte* was composed—was his happiest and his busiest period. But speed of workmanship, too, was the enemy of order and lucidity. The urge to teach was irresistible; Herder had to speak while his thoughts were still fresh in his mind; he left their arrangement and elaboration to take care of themselves. With promethean egoism he regarded himself as a second Luther² and was filled with an almost superstitious veneration for his own genius. When all else seemed without response, he struggled, in a manner not unlike that of Novalis at a later date, to grasp the universe through the medium of his own soul, to seek by personal union alone the knowledge of God he needed, in order to be able to teach His word. The developments in his thought, as well as in his destiny, drove Herder more and more into self-communion, and it was through self-communion that he made those discoveries that enabled his universal history to be attempted.

The way towards philosophy of history was prepared by the methods and aims Herder had followed hitherto. As philologist and critic he had striven from the beginning to explain each phenomenon by reference to its growth and milieu. This in itself was bound to direct him to

¹ Cf. especially (apart from the biographies of R. Haym, Berlin, 1880-5 and E. Kühnemann, Munich, 1927³) O. Baumgarten, *Herders Lebenswerk und die religiöse Frage der Gegenwart*, Tübingen, 1905; M. Doerne, *Die Religion in Herders Geschichtsphilosophie*, Leipzig, 1927; E. Gronau, *Herders religiöse Jugendentwicklung*, Diss. Kiel, 1931; T. Litt, *Herder und Kant als Deuter der geistigen Welt*, Leipzig, 1930; F. Meinecke, *Die Entstehung des Historismus*, Munich and Berlin, 1936; J. Nünck, *Die Begründung der Religion bei Herder*, Leipzig, 1912²; L. Posadzy, *Der entwicklungsgeschichtliche Gedanke bei Herder*, Diss. Münster, 1906; C. Siegel, *Herder als Philosoph*, Stuttgart, 1907; R. Stadelmann, *Der historische Sinn bei Herder*, Halle, 1928; H. Stephan, *Herder in Bückeberg*, Tübingen, 1905; R. Wielandt, *Herders Theorie von der Religion und den religiösen Vorstellungen*, Berlin, 1904. All these works contain much that is of great value for our problem, although they do not set out to deal with it as it is here presented, as is obvious in most cases from their titles. Stadelmann, however, is practically alone in not overstressing the exclusively theological aspect.

² Cf. Baumgarten, *op. cit.*, pp. 13 sq.

history as a field of study, if only merely as a background to his more specialized interests; and more intensively so, when historical data proved inadequate for his purposes, as was bound to be the case, seeing that he was incessantly concerned with the remotest beginnings of things. This same method, too, taught—indeed it was based upon—the recognition of the inherent interconnexion of all things.¹ Accordingly, when Herder studied the origins of religion, very much in the manner of Hume,² or interpreted poetry in relation to its general background of world civilization, it was only a step for him to begin to devote more and more attention to this background and to count literature and religion themselves (to keep to these two spheres of interest) as parts of it. And the step was a not unnatural one for a pupil of Hamann. This point is well illustrated by his attitude to Ossian, to whom he was unable to apply his ordinary critical method for sheer lack of knowledge of the primitive Celtic background; as soon as opportunity offered, he flung himself with enthusiasm into a study of all available accounts of Celtic literature, history and civilization; but so far from merely judging Ossian in the light of this information, he actually used him—with some caution indeed in view of his doubtful authority—as an additional source for his statements upon Celtic matters. There can be little doubt that these difficulties in connexion with Ossian contributed to the transition in Herder's thought from criticism to philosophy of history.

Ultimately, then, the only way to grasp all things in their fullness was to study the whole history of mankind, which encompassed everything. Otherwise he would be for ever explaining one unknown in terms of other unknowns, for ever seeking to evaluate, as it were, x and y and z , with nothing else to evaluate them by except themselves. For Herder, as for Faust, the subjects of the curriculum taken separately were unsatisfying. Without some radical, all-embracing re-orientation of his thought, what progress could he make?

Not only, however, was a comprehensive history of mankind the obvious task to be discharged, but, if it were to be entered upon at all, some definite, central point of view, to which everything could be related, was needed as well. In order that the long list of subjects that he enumerated in the *Reisejournal* might be started upon, some kind of co-ordination would first have to be achieved. The idea of development, as it made headway within Herder's scheme, at once emphasized this need and contributed to its satisfaction. But only by bringing another

¹ Meinecke, *op. cit.*, II, p. 408.

² Doerne, *op. cit.*, p. 10; Nimck, *op. cit.*, pp. 10 sqq.; Stephan, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

problem in its train. It necessarily implied development from a prime source to a final goal. It suggested the necessary perspective—once the source and the goal could be precisely determined.

A further point. At an early date it was clear to Herder that the whole structure of contemporary civilization was in need of reform. We have noted his desire to be a second Luther. Yet of what nature was his reform to be and how, in cold fact, was it to be effectively carried out? In the sphere of literature, Herder's method had been to seek out basic qualities, as revealed in the earliest beginnings of the subject, in order to show what should be aimed at. To extend this procedure to the whole of human life was a natural step. Especially natural to the aesthete in Herder, who was bound sooner or later to look upon the world itself as a work of art and to appreciate it in the same way as any other work of art—on historico-genetical lines; to absorb himself in it, that is, and to judge it, not by any external norms, but only by reference to the intention of its author. There still remained, of course, the vital question of ascertaining what this intention was. Every turn in his thought drove Herder again and again to face this fundamental question. As soon as he felt that he had discovered, or was on the point of discovering, the answer, the way forward would be clear. Then, and only then, in the same way as he wrote literary criticism in order to improve literature, so he would write historical criticism 'zur Bildung der Menschheit', as the title of his 1774 essay has it.

And once cultural regeneration could be achieved, Herder's more immediate literary problem would settle itself. The perfect milieu would produce the perfect type of poetry. As it was, it was obviously futile to go on preaching originality, feeling, spontaneity, so long as these things were nothing more than meaningless verbiage, as they clearly were to Klotz and the rest of contemporary *littérateurs*. Frustration in literary criticism, it may be reasonably argued, led Herder to the greater task. It is not suggested that he gave up criticism for history all at once, if indeed at all. The plans and hopes of the *Reisejournal* did not altogether thrust literature into a subordinate position. But there was an important difference. Herder's purpose in criticism now extended far beyond the mere task of improving German letters. He had reached the stage of using the evidence supplied by literature in order to contribute to the study of mankind. Literature had become the handmaid of history.

In its very nature the philosophy of history was a highly subjective sphere and the deficiencies of contemporary historical knowledge

facilitated the comprehensive survey that Herder had in mind.¹ More or less general impressions about the past prevailed in all circles, and personal ideas found in this subject a convenient vehicle for their dissemination. Fancy had a place as well as logic; feeling, of a religious or other character, took its place beside observation and inference. A field with these characteristics was the very one for Herder; his 'Gothic' imagination and his pedagogic impulse could find no more suitable channel for their activity.

The bases of Herder's task were thus ample and varied.

How did he set about his purpose? As in the conception of it, so in the execution, Herder was dependent upon the way his thoughts led him. It is obvious that his account of the history of language and his psychological writings that later matured into the *Plastik* and *Vom Erkennen und Empfinden* represent a widening of his position, if not indeed more than that. It was, however, not so much these as his literary and philological studies that in fact gave him the needed co-ordinating point of view. His increasingly intensive use of poetry as a means of throwing light upon history—the essays on Ossian and Shakespeare in *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst* contain ample evidence of this, the reverse of his earlier method of using history to throw light upon poetry—is the first of the deciding factors. This is instructively illustrated by the change that came over his attitude to the Bible, the only document, Herder observed,² that prevents us from regarding antiquity as exclusively Greek, and therefore all the worthier of the closest attention.

In his Riga days, when his position was very little removed from that of Spalding and Michaelis and when some masonic influence may be noted,³ Herder approached the book of Genesis from an almost purely literary angle, looking upon it as an example of primitive Hebrew poetry, determined by the circumstances—cultural, religious, geographical, historical—in which it was produced. The historico-genetical method was applied to the Bible, as to any other piece of literature: indeed, it is note-

¹ R. Unger, *Hamann und die Aufklärung*, Jena, 1911, I, pp. 273 sq., has shown the particular significance of this point for both Hamann and Herder.

² *SWS*, II, p. 116. Cf. also IV, pp. 214 sq.

³ Herder became a mason in 1766 (Haym, *op. cit.*, I, p. 106; cf. also L. Keller, *J. G. Herder und die Kultgesellschaften des Humanismus*, Berlin, 1904, pp. 26, 29). While it is no doubt true that through masonry Herder became interested in Oriental, Pythagorean and Egyptian lore, which is of importance for the material side of the *Älteste Urkunde* (cf. Maria Carolina von Herder, *Erinnerungen aus dem Leben Joh. Gottfrieds von Herder*, Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1830, I, pp. 102 sq.), it is unfair to regard his religious regeneration of the Buckeburg years as a superficial aberration from the true course of his life's work, as Keller (p. 48) appears to do. Keller is, however, right in drawing attention to Hamann's mocking use of the appellation 'Ritter vom Rosenkreuz' in his polemic against the essay on the origin of language (p. 47 n.).

worthy that the Bible was the first work to which it really was applied in all its thoroughness.¹ It was this rather untheological approach that led Herder to divide the Genesis story into its supposed folksong bases.

Herder did not remain long at this stage. Certainly he was not sufficiently sure of himself to publish the results he had attained. The shipwreck of 1770, while it momentarily strengthened the aesthetic attitude, inasmuch as he was enabled to understand more clearly the mode of composition followed by the primitive Hebrew poet (which meant that the value of the book of Genesis as revelation was dependent for him upon the capacity possessed by its poet to grasp and narrate his story), nevertheless, in the long run, led to a great advance upon this somewhat rationalistic position. As he himself experienced the sustaining power of God in the wind and light of that unforgettable morning, he was able to comprehend, indeed to feel for himself, in all its vividness the actual subject-matter of the Creation story. He learned, as Hamann had taught, to feel God in nature. The dawn, in which he made this fundamental discovery, is henceforth regarded as an ever-recurring symbol of Creation's morn. And he realized that God creating is, of necessity, God revealing Himself.

We know from the *Plastik* how very much stress Herder laid upon the actual sense-perception of things as a means of reaching the inner truth about their significance. It is, moreover, not without interest that it was at this moment that he read *Fingal* with peculiar eagerness. For if there was one thing that Ossian presented more than anything else, to Herder as to Goethe,² it was the sense of the utter loneliness and helplessness of man in face of nature, which embraces and determines all things, and which is itself governed, not by a God who stands outside it, but by the inherent Divine Spirit within it. In the presence of the limitless, overpowering cosmos, Herder discovered for himself this fuller meaning contained in the passages he was reading and thereby took a major step forward in his thought.

The aesthetic approach to the Bible in this way changed into a religious approach. Henceforth Herder searched, not for poetry alone in it, but for revelation. Not that there was any fundamental antagonism between the two; for what else at this time was a poet in his eyes but a direct spokes-

¹ Cf. *SWS*, vi, p. 87, for Herder's view of the futility of any other than a literary approach to the Genesis story at this time.

² Cf. H. Schoffer, *Die Leiden des jungen Werther. Ihr geistesgeschichtlicher Hintergrund*, Frankfurt, 1938, *passim*. It does not, however, seem necessary to conclude from this that Herder was a thoroughgoing pantheist in the Spinozan sense. (Cf. also p. 203, n. 1, *infra*.)

man of God, a part of His self-revelation,¹ and literature but the most eloquent setting-forth of His workings and intentions? So that, even regarded merely as literature, the Bible possessed divine authority. Its peculiar subject-matter, however, placed it before all other literature in importance. Herder now looked upon it both as a chronicle of events and as God's own commentary upon them.

Herder's belief, reinforced if not engendered by the shipwreck, that all nature is the revelation of an all-embracing, all-sustaining Godhead, is fundamental. It produces a great simplification in his outlook. It is the unifying basis upon which everything else rests. It endows earlier ideas with a new and compelling significance, and gives a fresh religious colouring to every aspect of his work. Literary criticism, linguistic and psychological research, history, the impulse to reform, all are henceforth under its domination; and the more powerful its influence becomes, the more closely do these specialized aspects merge into one another so as to be hardly distinguishable. (Indeed, of few authors may the same works, even the same passages, be studied and utilized from so many separate points of view.) It was a central discovery, but so long as the one primary problem, that of knowing God's intention, was unsolved, the structure of Herder's thought was incomplete. The Faustian urge to know the unknowable was his, too. He battled with himself in solitary self-communion. The Bible, as never before, was his constant companion. He sought for new interpretations, and into them he projected much of his own mysticism.

He turned, in his need, to Hamann once again after a gap of almost three years in their correspondence, and Hamann's influence was at no time so powerful as in these early years in Bükeburg. Hamann had objected to Herder's naturalistic view of the origin of language. Herder was himself dissatisfied with it² and was ready, after the first flush of anger, to come round to his friend's position. Mere analysis, mere observation, the latter felt—and Herder now agreed—led nowhere. Faith, self-surrender, divination, the ignoring of all personal and accidental factors, which act as barriers between ourselves and the truth, are alone of value. Thought is not the key to the understanding of history, but history is the key to the understanding of thought. The comprehension of nature is not achieved through the co-ordination by the reason of a number of

¹ H. Wolf, 'Die Genielehre des jungen Herder', *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, III (1925), pp. 401 sqq., gives what is still the best account of this.

² *Herders Briefwechsel mit Caroline Flachsland*, hrsg. von Hans Schauer (Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft, xxxix, xli), Weimar, 1926-8, II, pp. 25 sq., *Herders Briefe an Hamann*, hrsg. von O. Hoffmann, Berlin, 1889, p. 66.

impressions, but through a religious self-absorption in it, as in the revelation of God. And of the Bible, too, it was clear that an aesthetic, or any other interpretation that did not regard it as a source of faith, would be worse than meaningless.¹ To the Bible, then, and to history, Herder's attitude was one of devout awe and adoration. He surrendered himself to them as he had surrendered himself to the power of the dawn.

The effects of correspondence with Lavater,² who, very shortly afterwards, reinforced Herder's belief that this world is merely a preparation for the next, must not be overlooked, inasmuch as it drew attention to the idea of an ultimate goal with which his philosophy might be rounded off. But the final contribution to his scheme came actually from another quarter. For at this point Herder's experience of Shakespeare intervened and was decisive. Shakespeare showed him the manner in which events are fatefully interconnected, and governed and determined by a dominating, creative mind. Happenings and endeavours, though mystifying to those actually participating in them, are seen to hang together, as soon as they are viewed from the standpoint of the playwright's directing hand. The actors in a drama obey laws that exist although they may be unaware of them. And if, as Herder realized to the full, the playwright was a kind of miniature Creator, with all the attributes of the Divine, and was indeed a veritable part of it, what could be easier than to look upon the Creator as a kind of master-playwright, disposing of persons and events in the history of the world, rather as Shakespeare did in his dramas,³ in order that some end, decided upon by Him but ungrasped by the human actors, might be fulfilled? With all the world a stage⁴—though not quite in Jaques's sense—the likening of God to a mighty poet and dramatist follows as a matter of course. That Shakespeare taught Herder to see the great and sublime, the mysterious and tragic in history, is no less true,

¹ R. Unger, *op cit.* and, more recently, E. Metzke, *J. G. Hamanns Stellung in der Philosophie des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswiss. Kl. x, 3), Halle, 1934, *passim*, in the latter, cf. especially pp. 231 sqq.

² Cf. R. Haym, *Herder nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken*, Berlin, 1880–85, I, pp. 503 sqq.

³ The implication contained in the parenthesis in the following lines from a vital passage in the Shakespeare essay is inescapable: 'alle—was wir in der Hand des Welterschöpfers sind—unwissende, blinde Werkzeuge zum Ganzen Eines theatralischen Bildes, Einer Grosse habenden Begebenheit, die nur der Dichter überschauet' (*SWS*, v, p. 219).

⁴ The Ossian essay in *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst* speaks significantly of history as 'ein Fortgang von Scenen', 'ein fortgehendes Schauspiel' (*SWS*, v, p. 168). In the writings of slightly later date, cf. *SWS*, xxxi, p. 328, 'es ist Alles eine irrdische Schaubühne zu höhern Zwecken' (1774)—distinctly an echo of the thought of the passage just quoted in n. 3 above; v, pp. 513, 515, 526; 'Bühne der Menschheit', p. 559 '... weil etwa noch alle Scenen, in deren jeder jeder Schauspieler nur Rolle hat, in der er sterben und glücklich seyn kann—alle Scenen noch etwa ein Ganzes, eine Hauptvorstellung machen können, von der freilich der einzelne, eigennützige Spieler nichts wissen und sehen, die aber der Zuschauer im rechten Gesichtspunkte und in ruhiger Abwartung des Folgenden wohl sehen könnte'.

but of subsidiary importance in face of this fundamental addition to his thought.¹

Shakespeare, then, brought home to Herder, as nothing else could have done, that at the direction of a supreme Will all things could and did emerge from some prime source and move towards some preordained goal, as in a drama. The Bible added to this that the source and goal of all things was in God, and it is clear why Herder came to insist more and more upon this, rather than upon its merely poetical aspect. The connexion between Shakespeare and the Bible is, moreover, almost certainly chronological as well as logical, although ultimate clarity concerning this, the most confused period of Herder's life is probably impossible. We do, however, know the significant fact that his novel conception of Shakespeare was brought about immediately after the acquisition of Percy's *Reliques* in August 1771, and that his biblical studies received a fresh impetus at the beginning of 1772, the date of his association with the Countess Maria and the resumption of the Hamann correspondence. So that it may be said that a new sense of the personality of God, acquired in the course of his Shakespearean studies—in all probability he looked upon Him rather like the Lord in Goethe's 'Prologue in Heaven'—prepared Herder's mind for the new impressions these friendships brought him.

Through Shakespeare Herder's historical scheme had thus obtained its axis. It is not, then, merely by accident that *Auch Eine Philosophie* followed closely upon the Shakespeare essay. The latter had opened up a perspective so vast that it could not cope with it and was broken off. Once Herder could find out more closely from the Bible about the nature of the plan which Shakespeare proved to exist behind events, once he could discover the meaning of the great drama which God was directing, there would be nothing more to hinder the writing of his philosophy of history. The *Älteste Urkunde* supplied the last link; the first three parts of this work actually were written, to be sure, immediately after the historical essay, but the preliminary studies for the two books were simultaneous.

In this way Herder slipped into the philosophy of history, almost without noticing it until he was deep in its toils. The purely philological approach to the Bible was now as impossible as the purely literary attitude to Shakespeare had become. The Genesis story is now not only Eastern poetry, but the oldest document of the race.² Its study is no

¹ Cf. Stadelmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 138 sqq., and A. Gillies, *Modern Language Review*, xxxii (1937), pp. 279 sq.

² Cf. Haym, *op. cit.*, pp. 552 sqq.

202 *Herder's Approach to the Philosophy of History*

longer a mere contribution to Hebrew archaeology, but the one and only guide to the understanding of the whole of human life. It is both history and the key to history. It is a document of more value than the speculations of philosophers. With its aid the world may be understood from its beginnings, since in it is God's own statement of His intention.¹ Herder's genetical method, it is seen, was never given up at any point. He accepts the historicity of the Creation story and therefore of God's self-revelation; all our civilization derives from the one act of Creation—'Im Anfang war die Tat'; the one source of all effort is God.² Further, he asserts God's instruction of man through a mystic language of signs. He isolates a divine hieroglyph; its basis is the human form—'Das Ebenbild der Gottheit'; it is the oldest poetical image of the cosmos and of its purpose and is the source of all knowledge and wisdom, somewhat like Faust's macrocosm-sign.³ Finally, he insists that the whole Creation story is made understandable to man through the sight of the dawn, its ever-recurring symbol; a symbol, too, that Creation, i.e. revelation, is for ever going on as part of the world process.

Herder's youthful intention of merely comparing the Genesis story with the various versions which Milton, Klopstock, Bodmer and Gessner had provided,⁴ is no longer recognizable in a work which, so far from exemplifying the methods of modern comparative criticism, is a clear return to the outlook of the Middle Ages in such things as the sub-

¹ *SWS*, vi, pp. 253 sq., 317, 415; vii, pp. 145 sq. ('Die Sage erzählt uns in ihrer Einfalt mehr, als dichtende Philosophen über den seyn sollend nothwendigen Fortgang des Menschengeschlechts aus Abgründen von Vordersätzen gerathen haben'), similarly, in *An Prediger Funfzehn Provinzialblätter* (1774) even more emphatically, vii, p. 301 ('Gottes Ordnung im Menschengeschlechte! Haushaltung Gottes auf Erden, nur auf der Höhe der Offenbarung ist Blick; der Pragmatische Reflexionsgeist mit seinem Gelieferten wird seyn Staub, den der Wind zerstreuet! Die edelste Naturgeschichte wird Theologie'); and in the *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament* (1775), vii, pp. 358, 368-72 ('Unsere Bibel ist auf die einfachste Weise. Geschichte und Lehre, die ein Kind versteht, und ein Plan in ihr entwickelt, der für niemanden zu kalt, zu hoch, zu schwer, und doch Aufschluss der Menschlichen Natur ist, die Summe unsrer Erwartungen und Wünsche! Er regt alle unsre Seelenkräfte, beschäftigt alle unsre Triebe, geht vom Anfange des Menschengeschlechts aus, ins heilige Dunkel der fernsten Zukunft, verliert sich im Ewigen und im Licht Und Jesus ist der Mittelpunkt und Eckstein des Ganzen. .', pp. 370 sq.), also *Briefe an Hamann*, p. 80 ('Glauben Sie, mein liebster Freund, es wird einst werden, dass die Offenbarung und Religion Gottes, statt dass sie jetzt Kritik und Politik ist, simple Geschichte und Weisheit unsres Geschlechts werde. Die magre Bibel wird alle 7 Wissenschaften der Alten, und 1000 der Neuen Welt, wie die fetten Kuhe Pharaons in sich schlucken—dann wird sich aber die Noth erst anheben—bis ein Tag kommt, der durch Facta und Acta Alles entsiegelt. Glücklich, von fern dazu vorbereitet, verkündigt, beigetragen zu haben. Ich bin nun einmal der Wissenschaften Diener, aber treulich will ich ihnen dienen'—May 1774).

² Cf. Doerne, *op. cit.*, pp. 26 sqq., 99.

³ The highly important findings of Konrad Burdach, still inadequately known in this country, upon the question of the connexion of the *Älteste Urkunde* with *Faust*, should be compared at this point ('Faust und Moses', *Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1912, xxxiii, xxxv, xxxviii, especially pp. 646 sqq.).

⁴ Maria Carolina von Herder, *Erinnerungen aus dem Leben Joh. Gottfrieds von Herder*, Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1830, i, pp. 90 sq.

stitution of revelation for observation and the likening of the human form to the cosmos.¹ But, when the *Alteste Urkunde* is read in association with the sermons of the Buckeburg years, Herder's general position becomes considerably clearer. Before a peasant congregation he could be neither so full nor so involved as in his writings, and his fundamental beliefs accordingly emerge in relative simplicity. The existence of a divine purpose in the world, which is inscrutable and will not be fully known till the end;² the presence and activity of God in all nature, in which each being has an appointed sphere;³ the idea of a life lived in accordance with all the powers that nature has given us;⁴ the uselessness of contemporary culture by reason of its unnaturalness, unnaturalness being equivalent to sin or deviation from God's purpose;⁵ a kind of pelagian acceptance of the innate purity of man;⁶ the assertion that religion, founded upon revelation and faith, is the one central factor in all human effort⁷—these are all themes that recur in his philosophy of history. They signify, it may be noted in passing, an immense contrast to the more sociological than theological standpoint of his Riga sermons.⁸

The three main themes, which Meinecke⁹ has distinguished in *Auch Eine Philosophie der Geschichte*, now fall into their true perspective. The idea of development, one of the oldest in all Herder's thought, acquires a religious colouring from the Bible and a dramatic flavour from Shakespeare. Development is seen to have started from an initial intention and to point to an ultimate goal. It has been suggested that the absence of Christian orthodoxy in Herder's essay accounts for its inconclusiveness, in that it was not until after 1774 that the idea of redemption through Christ came to full fruition in his mind; that it was not until then that his conception of the Kingdom of God achieved a really positive form, having been left vague in the meantime.¹⁰ Herder's view

¹ Cf. E. W. Strothmann, 'Das scholastische Erbe im Herderschen "Pantheismus"', *Dichtung und Volkstum*, xxxvii (1936), pp. 174 sqq., who points out that medieval scholasticism was transmitted to Herder through academic Protestant theology, and corrects, as mistaken, the view that Herder was a pantheist.

² The sermons teem with passages that may be quoted. In this and the following notes a few references are selected from the many. Cf. *SWS*, xxxi, pp. 221 sqq., 284 sq., 290, 319 sq., 403.

³ *SWS*, xxxi, pp. 204, 279, 302 sqq., 310.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 176, 186-94, 235.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 158 sqq., 161. Cf. also O. Loerke, 'Herders Weltgebaude. Ein Umriss', *Neue Rundschau*, 1935, p. 575; Stephan, *op. cit.*, pp. 150 sq., 195; Baumgarten, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

⁶ *SWS*, xxxi, pp. 161, 176 sq., 213, 219-37. Also Baumgarten, *loc. cit.*

⁷ Cf. Doerne, *op. cit.*, pp. 24 sq.; Stephan, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

⁸ Baumgarten, *op. cit.*, pp. 23 sqq., Doerne, *op. cit.*, p. 65; Haym, *op. cit.*, pp. 93, 284 sqq. Wielandt, *op. cit.*, p. 17. But cf. also E. Gronau, *op. cit.*, who brings out the strong religious undercurrent.

⁹ Meinecke, *op. cit.*, p. 416.

¹⁰ Doerne, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

of the progress of history, on the other hand, was far from being vague. He saw it as a drama, the conflict of God with the forces that oppose Him. 'Der Gang Gottes in der Natur' means that the laws of nature cannot be violated with impunity. Man is, to be sure, God's instrument, but may be His enemy, if he does not observe His instruction. The parallel of Faust again suggests itself, for the victory of God is assured from the beginning and the earthly struggle is only a further manifestation of His rulership.¹ This is very little removed from fatalism—'Schicksal' and 'Vorsehung' are indeed interchangeable terms at this time. Man is a mere player in the mighty drama of God, no more than an ant on the wheel of progress.² All he can do is to recognize and fulfil his small task. As a drama, finally, history is full of violent action, of catastrophic revolution. Herder's discovery of this is traceable directly to his Shakespearean studies.³

Secondly, Herder's charge of degeneracy had had a long preparation in his earlier works. But never before had it contained so much bitterness. *Auch Eine Philosophie der Geschichte* is a veritable service of commination against his age. Once he had arrived at the position that revelation is the basis of all history—he declared that the main reason for accepting Biblical evidence was that the Enlightenment rejected it!⁴—it became easier than ever for him to speak of decline, of a falling away from God,⁵ and to indulge his long pent-up anger against rationalism. He showed how much the century was at variance with the real purpose of human history, unlike those earlier periods which it despised as barbarous. The disparity between mankind when it stood in close relationship with God, and modern man, was patent for all who had eyes to see. A modern Socrates—Hamann is meant, of course—speaks in vain to an age that lacks simplicity of manners and character.⁶ Revelation, and faith in it, must again become the centre of human life. That human solidarity which the Enlightenment vainly sought to achieve through reason had been obtained and could again be obtained through the piety, feeling and pulsing animation of the Middle Ages, to which Shakespeare, their culminating exponent, had drawn him.⁷ Or, put somewhat differently in the language of the *Älteste Urkunde*, the ever-returning dawn can teach man every day if he will so attune himself, what it has taught since the

¹ Doerne, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

² *SWS*, v, p. 531.

³ Stadelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 141, unlike Doerne, *op. cit.* p. 89, is undoubtedly right in seeing the connexion with Shakespeare.

⁴ *SWS*, v, p. 478.

⁵ Doerne, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

⁶ *SWS*, v, pp. 568 sq.

⁷ *Modern Language Review*, xxxii (1937), p. 278. Cf. also, however, Stephan, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

beginning, the creativeness, order and living purpose within the universe;¹ it is a far more eloquent guide than all the chaos of contemporary happenings:

Die unbeschreiblich hohen Werke
Sind herrlich wie am ersten Tag.

From this religious version of Rousseauist primitivism it is an easy step to Meinecke's third point, the idea of the continual self-revelation of God and His education of mankind. Since God is everywhere in nature, it follows that each phenomenon, however insignificant to human eyes, is of value in the eternal scheme of things. Everything is at once an end and a means to an end. Evil as well as good thus has its place; indeed evil may be, in fact must be, a preparatory stage of good, since all things serve God's ultimate intention. Mephistopheles has his part to play as well as Faust. The progressive self-revelation of God cannot but add to man's knowledge of Him, if accepted in the proper way. God is thus an educator of the human race, the world a vast school, in which each must both learn and add to learning by fulfilling the task allotted him by Providence; and the end of it all is to be a higher than human life.

It is hardly necessary to say that *Auch Eine Philosophie der Geschichte* did not fulfil Herder's idea of 'Universalgeschichte', as set out in the *Reisejournal*.² It was neither universal nor was it history. It was limited to antiquity and Western Europe, for the intention was to give an account of the origins and foundations of contemporary civilization, so as to show that it was not, as it fancied, the product of reason, but the outcome of a number of historical causes, and that earlier times, which had not known the benefits of Enlightenment, had attained the purpose of Providence better. At the same time, with reckless inconsistency, Herder argued that, bad as it was, his own age must form the basis of the future. His idea of historical evolution would allow of no other conclusion, and the poetical image that he uses, of a tree ever renewing itself, is only introduced in order to save the situation. Clearly, the polemicist in Herder was at loggerheads with the historian. And while it should not be forgotten that the polemical impulse, among other things, caused him to make a close study of history, it was not until it receded to a subsidiary position that he was able to attempt the *Ideen*. The reassertion of this impulse at the very end of his life accompanies a decline in his historical value.

¹ Burdach's admirable work (p. 651) should again be compared.

² Cf. Meinecke's invaluable criticism, *op. cit.*, pp. 416 sqq., and R. Adam, 'Wesen und Grenzen der organischen Geschichtsauffassung bei J. G. Herder', *Historische Zeitschrift*, CLV (1937), p. 39.

Herder, like Faust, did not wish to be a mere spectator of the world, but actively to intervene in its course. His manner of intervention was the preacher's. He was not a philosopher of history in the accepted sense. He did not set out to be one. He became one because his thought dictated it; and as was natural he brought with him much of what had engaged him in more restricted spheres. His previous achievement, while forwarding the growth of his new purpose, also tied his hands.

Herder, then, did not study history for its own sake. Its attraction was ultimately religious. It was a means by which he could satisfy his urge to know God through His works—much in the same way as he studied Shakespearean drama in order to know Shakespeare and his 'Kunst- und Schopferweise'. For Herder's history was theocentric. It was at once the servant of religion and the outcome of religion. Herder saw, as Newman did, that revealed religion furnishes facts which the sciences alone can never reach. The Bible, in fruitful association with Shakespeare, provided that sense of the unity and continuity of all things that Herder needed if his youthful plan were to materialize; and now he set himself the twofold task of interpreting history in the light of biblical revelation and at the same time of utilizing history to shed further light upon revelation. It was a task that was quite beyond his powers. It is known that Herder had in mind a second part of *Auch Eine Philosophie*, which was to be entirely theological and was to contain the key to the work as we know it. It is because this second part was never written that we are obliged to turn to the other works of the Buckeburg period to try to ascertain what its content might have been. And this, after all, is the only way to appreciate the full significance of the essay. It was one among many other writings, all of them bound together by the one central determination to comprehend the purpose of Providence, so far as it is knowable in revelation and in history—which for Herder were one and the same thing.

A. GILLIES.

HULL.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

'AD IMPRIMENDUM SOLUM'

The significance of the qualified licence *cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum* has been so obscured by the passage of time, that views regarding its interpretation are contradictory and almost mutually exclusive.

A. W. Pollard says:

Every book, as I understand the proclamation, required a licence, but this licence was not to be paraded by the use of the words 'Cum privilegio regali' without these words being limited and restricted by the addition 'ad imprimendum solum'. These must therefore be construed 'only for printing', i.e. not for protection, unless this was expressly stated, in which case the 'licence' was raised to the higher rank of a 'privilege'.¹

The restriction 'for printing only' offers a wide field of prohibition, and there is no evidence here to support the selection of 'not for protection' as the particular prohibition implied. There is, moreover, nothing in the proclamation to support the assertion that the licence was 'not for protection, unless this was expressly stated, in which case the "licence" was raised to the higher rank of a "privilege"'.²

E. M. Albright takes an opposing stand:

I cannot find an instance where the phrase seems to me to mean 'only for printing' rather than 'for printing *sole*', which is, I believe, the natural interpretation of the words, as based on their use. Tudor Latin has stranger constructions by far than *ad imprimendum solum* as meaning for *printing sole*, i.e. to the exclusion of all others from a similar right to print the work in question.²

Not one instance is given of the use of the phrase *ad imprimendum solum* occurring in a grant of privilege or 'copyright'. Moreover, acceptance of this interpretation entails regarding the phrase as a privilege, in the sense of a sole right to print, whereas it is almost certainly merely a licence. It is probably the use of the word 'privilegium' which is responsible for this error, although evidence demonstrates that the word 'privilege' was used indiscriminately for both 'licence' and 'privilege' and that, as a matter of fact, the confusion is still rife. There is seldom any doubt as to which meaning any particular usage implies, but the same word is used for both. In Fox's *Acts and Monuments* there is a

¹ Pollard, A. W., 'Regulation of the Book Trade in the Sixteenth Century', *The Library*, series 3, VII, p. 23.

² Albright, E. M., 'Ad Imprimendum Solum', *Modern Language Notes*, xxxiv (1919), p. 98.

marginal note: '*The Byble put forth with the kings priuiledge*',¹ while the text, dealing with the Matthew Bible, states that Cromwell:

...obtemed that the same might freely passe to be read of hys subiectes *with hys graces licence*.¹ So that there was Printed upon the same booke, one lyne in red letters with these wordes: Set forth with the kings most gracious licence.²

The syllabus of Rymer's *Foedera* contains the item:

Licence to Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch to print such service books as shall be in use for seven years next ensuing.³

But the document referred to is a privilege, granting exclusive printing rights, and is called a privilege throughout, although the privilege as printed in the books according to order is entitled 'the Kinges moste gracious Priuiledge and licence'.

A current example of this confusion exists in the catalogue of the Bible Exhibit in the British Museum. The note on James Nycholson's reprint of the bible of 1535 runs:

After the book had been in circulation for some time, *Royal privilege* was granted to it, and James Nycholson's quarto reprint bears the words 'Set foorth with the Kynges moost gracious licence'.⁴

So that the use of the word 'privilege' in a phrase is no conclusive evidence that such a phrase is anything more than a licence to print, especially since there is sufficient evidence to prove that it is actually a licence only and nothing more.

The phrase appearing on the title-pages of the bibles of 1535 and 1537 is 'with the King's most gracious licence', unquestionably only a licence to print. This phrase is replaced after the issuing of the proclamation of 1538 by *cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum*, which, by analogy, may be assumed to be merely a licence to print, as well. Furthermore, in 1543, Grafton and Whitchurch were granted a seven-year privilege for printing, among other service books, the breviary. In accordance with the proclamation of 1538, the breviaries of 1541, printed before the grant, contain only the phrase *cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum* on the title-page, while those of 1544, after the granting of the exclusive printing rights, contain the phrase *cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum* on the title-page and, on the other side of the page, a copy in full of the King's privilege. From which one may deduce that the phrase on the title-page is only a licence to print.

¹ Italics mine.

² Fox, John, *Acts and Monuments*, 4th ed. 1583, p. 1191. Quoted by A. W. Pollard in *Records of the English Bible*, p. 228. One of the reasons given for calling in Sir John Smith's book was 'bycause they be printed without priuelege': MS. Lansd. 64, no. 43, f. 105.

³ Rymer's *Foedera*, xiv, p. 766.

⁴ *Catalogue of Printed Books etc.*, p. 38. Italics mine.

If further confirmation is needed, the correction of the first draft of the proclamation under discussion settles the matter:

item that no person or persons usyng the occupacion of prynting in this Realme shall from henc-forth prynte eny boke in the Englishe tong with theise wordes (cum privilegio Regali) onless they have first *licence*¹ of his highness graunted upon examination made by some of his graces privy counsaill to printe the same.²

E. M. Albright makes one statement, the significance of which seems to have escaped her, which contains an important clue to what, in my opinion, is the correct interpretation of the qualification *ad imprimendum solum*.

The general purpose of the whole proclamation... (is) to prevent the surreptitious insertion of offensive matter after allowance.³

Both the foregoing interpretations of *ad imprimendum solum* construe it, albeit from opposing standpoints, as a commercial regulation. Such a trade restriction is hopelessly misplaced in the midst of a section of the proclamation dealing with unauthorized annotations. It has no place at all in a proclamation such as that of 1538, which is manifestly concerned with foiling attempts to undermine the established religion. Let us examine carefully two parallel passages in the proclamation, one complaining of the subversive activities to be dealt with, the other setting forth regulations for dealing with them. The first passage inveighs against such

books as have been prented within his realme sett forth w^t priviledge conteynnyng annotacions and additions in the margines, prologs, and calendars, imagyned and invented by the makers dyvisers and *printers of the same bookes*....⁴

The second passage presents the new ruling calculated to combat such unscrupulous ingenuity:

...no person or persones in this realm shall from hensforth printe any books in the Englishe tonge onles... they shall have lycence so to do and yet so having nott to put thes wordes cum privilegio Regali w^t owght addyng ad imprimendum solum .. nor from hensforth shall print or bring into this his realme any boks of dyvyn scripture in the English tong w^t any annotacions in the margyn or any prologe or addytions in the Calendar or table except by the Kyngs hieghnes &c but oonly the playn sentence and text.⁵

Apparently the ingenious printers had been inserting unorthodox marginal notes and prefaces into a translation of the scripture after it had been perused and allowed. To prevent such a practice, all those printers who received the King's licence or permission to print were to add to this

¹ Italics mine.

² Quoted by A. W. Reed in 'Regulation of the Book Trade before the Proclamation of 1538', *Bibliographical Society Transactions*, xv, pp. 157-84.

³ Albright, E. M., *op. cit.*, p. 99.

⁴ Quoted by Strype in *Life and Acts of Thomas Cranmer*, App. VIII. Italics mine.

⁵ *Ibid.*

licence the words *ad imprimendum solum*, meaning *for printing only*; his licence, in other words, permitted him to set forth in print the book as it had been when perused and allowed by the authorities; he was to restrict his activities to *printing only*, such matters as post-perusal annotations being forbidden to him. The words mean just what they say; the printer was to print, and do nothing else. And this stringent limitation of the printer's activities was to be made clear to him who chanced to read. If it should be found that the printer had exceeded his licence, the book was not safe to read nor to possess, and it was important for the reader to know just how far the cautious authorities had ventured in guaranteeing the innocuous nature of the book. This precautionary licence also rendered a book still liable to recall, in spite of the King's licence, if the qualification had been disregarded.

Which is what happened to the Matthew Bible, almost certainly the source of this proclamation. This bible contains extensive marginal notes¹ and long prefaces, both of which were deleted in later editions, the former being replaced by various printed symbols. Fox says of this bible:

The setting forth of this booke did not a litle offend the Clergy, namely, the Bishop aforesaid (Bonner), both for the Prologues and specially because in the same booke was one special table collected of the common places in the Bible, and the scriptures for the approbation of the same, and chiefly about the supper of the Lord and marriage of priests, and the masse, which there was said not to be found in the Scripture.

¹ Examples of such annotations are innumerable. Here are a few:

Ch. iii of the *Epistle to the Romans*. the note to 'Which will rewarde euery mā accordyng to hys deades' runs

thys sayyng may no man so vnderstande/as though worcke dyd iustifye in deade before God· for then maketh he thys whole Epistle false/which onely laboureth to proue y^t oure synnes are forgeuen frely throughe mercye/for christes sake/& not for oure deserynges or workes. Knowe ye therefore y^t S. Paul dothe not heare ascribe iustification to workes &c.

In the Cranmer Bible, a hand is substituted in the margin for this note.

To 'If the blynde leade the blynde/both shall fall into y^e dych' from the Gospel accordyng to St Matthew, ch. xv, there is this note:

Origin and Chrisostom vnderstande thys of the Pharises because of their euell opinions. Hilarius and Erasmus vnderstand it of mennes tradicions.

To. 'For he shall delyuer the from the snare of the hunter/' in Psalm xci, is the note:

This snare here signifieth all naughtye doctryne/whether it be taken of the scripture euell expounded/or of the euell inuenciōs of mē/

And in Cranmer's Bible, a pointing hand is substituted for the following provocative note on the Gospel according to St Matthew, ch. xxiii·

The Scribes and Pharises syt in Moses seate &c. Erasmus in his annotaciōs noteth thē that wresteth thys text to that purpose/that we shuld obaye all thynges y^t bisshoppes commaunde/or rulers (though they be wicked) for y^e offyce sake wherin they are: where as Christ (sayth he) speaketh of thē that do truly teache y^e lawe of Moses/and not of soche as wrappe them in the cōstytycyons of men And euen now haply/must y^e bysshop be heard y^t doth truly teache y^e gospell though he lyue skant Gospell lyke: But who can suffer them agaynst Christes doctryne for their awne profytes to make & vnmake lawes/exercisyng vpō y^e people playne tyranie/and measuryng all thing for their awne aduauntage & auctorite: They that with tradyciōs ymagyned for their awne lucre & tyrannye do hamper the people/do not sit in y^e chere of y^e Gospell/but in the chayre of Symon Magus and Layphas. These are the very wordes of Erasmus vpon this place.

Furthermore, after the restraint of this foresayde Bible of Mathew, another Bible began to be printed at Paris, an 1540. which was called the Bible of the large Volume... In this Bible, although the former notes of Thomas Mathew was omitted, yet sondry markes and handes were annexed in the sides, which ment that in those places shuld be made certeine notes, wherwith also the clergy was offended, though the notes were not made.

...Then Grafton (the printer) was called, and first charged with the printing of Mathewes Bible, but he being feareful of trouble, made excuses for himselfe in all things. Then was he examined of the great Bible, and what notes he was purposed to make. To the whiche he aunswered, that he knewe none. For his purpose was to haue retayned learned men to haue made the notes, but when he perceyued the kynges maiestie, and his Clergye not willing to haue any, he proceded no further. But for al these excuses, Grafton was sent to the Fleet, and there remayned VI weekes ...¹

Of interest is an item in Bishop Bonner's list of prohibited books, issued in 1542:

The table gloosses marginall and preface before the Epystle of Sainte Paule ad Romanos of Thos. Matthewes doynge, and prynted by yonde the see withoute pryvilege in his bible in Englshe.²

So we can see that these unauthorized annotations occupied an important position among the multitudinous anxieties of harassed authority: important enough to call forth a proclamation condemning them and their devisers. Then it is surely not out of the question that the phrase introduced for the first time in this particular proclamation³ refers to such unlicensed additions to the English Scriptures, in an attempt to prevent the printers from using that ingenuity which always flourishes under a regime of repressive censorship.

BETTY SHAPIN.

WIDMER END, BUCKS.

THE SOURCE OF SHADWELL'S CHARACTER OF SIR FORMAL TRIFLE IN 'THE VIRTUOSO'

All students of Restoration drama are familiar with the sturdy figure of Sir Formal Trifle in Shadwell's *The Virtuoso* (1676)—a humour sketch not easily forgotten; and it is natural that the Reverend Montague

¹ Fox, J., *Acts and Monuments*, 1583, p. 1191. Quoted by A. W. Pollard in *Records of the English Bible*, pp. 229 ff. See also Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, I, part 1, pp. 473, 575; Cranmer, I, p. 117, *Annals of the Reformation*, II, part 1, p. 324.

² Fox, J., *Acts and Monuments*, v, Appendix No. x. Remember that the Bible itself had received the King's licence.

³ Grafton, in a letter to Cromwell, dated 1 December 1538, says:

... (the daye before) this present (daye) came there a post named (M) Nycolas which brought yo^r lordshipes letters to my lorde of harfforde, with the which was bounde a certen inhubicion for pryntynge of bookes, and for addynge of these wordes Cūm privilegio. Then as sone as my lorde of harfforde had receaved yt, he sent ymedyatylye for Mr. Coūdale and me, readyng the same thyng vnto us, in the which is expressed, that we shuld adde these wordes (ad imprimendum solum) which wordes we neuer heard of before. MS. Cott. Cleopatra E V, f. 347.

The use of the word *inhibition* is of interest here.

Summers, in his edition of the dramatist's works,¹ should devote some space to an appreciation of this character. What Mr Summers says is praise scarcely too high for the finished portrait of the knight, but on one point he is perhaps led astray. In his separate introduction to the play,² under *Source*, he quotes from the *Biographia Dramatica*: 'This play contains an infinite deal of true humour, and a great variety of characters, highly drawn and perfectly original, particularly those of Sir Nicholas Gimcrack and Sir Formal Trifle, which had been hitherto untouched upon, though of a kind that were very frequent at that period.' The central point of this quotation, which Mr Summers implicitly accepts, is the originality of the principal characters, particularly Sir Nicholas and Sir Formal.

We are not here concerned with the originality of Sir Nicholas Gimcrack, the Virtuoso, a perfectly foolish but delightful person; but the character or humour of Sir Formal Trifle seems, unquestionably, to be borrowed from an early play of Sir William D'Avenant called *News From Plymouth* (ca. 1635).

Before considering the evidence for such a statement, we may sum up very briefly the views of the few Shadwell critics, besides Mr Summers, who offer some discussion of the play or character. Both Mr Borgman³ and Mr Lloyd⁴ seem to accept without question Shadwell's statement that: 'Four of the Humors are entirely new.'⁵ Mr Miles, alone, in his study of the influence of Molière upon Restoration comedy, suggests a source for Shadwell's character. He thinks Sir Formal is 'reminiscent' of Acaste in *Le Misanthrope*,⁶ a debt which Mr Borgman quite emphatically denies.⁷

In *News From Plymouth*, one of the lesser known of D'Avenant's early comedies, we are introduced to 'a foolish old knight', by name Sir Solemn Trifle, whose chief delight in life is to talk with 'art, judgment, language, elegance of phrase', who professes 'to hate impertinence and babbling', and who continually insists upon interrupting his companions with the assurance that 'he knows what you would say'.⁸

¹ *The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell*, ed. Montague Summers, 5 vols. (London, 1927).

² III, 97.

³ A. S. Borgman, *Thomas Shadwell, His Life and Comedies* (New York, 1928), p. 162.

⁴ C. Lloyd, 'Shadwell and the Virtuosi', *P.M.L.A.*, XLIV (1929), 473.

⁵ Dedication to *The Virtuoso* (Summers, III, 101).

⁶ D. H. Miles, *The Influence of Molière on Restoration Comedy* (New York, 1910), p. 240.

⁷ P. 164.

⁸ *The Dramatic Works of Sir William D'Avenant*, ed. Maidment and Logan, 5 vols (Edinburgh, 1872-4). Vol. iv contains *News From Plymouth*. The last continually repeated phrase (derived ultimately from Plautus' *Aulularia*) and the rude way in which Sir Solemn interrupts all attempts at conversation remind one very strongly of the mannerism and

So far any similarity between the two characters, apart from the name, might quite conceivably be accidental, but a very real connection becomes apparent when we reach the third act of Shadwell's play.¹ Here we find the mischievous Clarinda and Miranda with their lovers, Longvil and Bruce, confronted with the problem of trying to rid themselves of tiresome, wordy old Sir Formal. The plan upon which they agree is an amusing one. To tickle the old knight's vanity, and to distract his attention, they beg him to make a speech extempore upon any subject they may mention.² Delighted, Sir Formal agrees and sets sail in an ocean of rhetoric on the subject of 'a Mouse inclosed in a Trap'. Half way through his lecture he suddenly disappears

For Bruce and Longvil had a *Trap* prepar'd,
And down they sent the yet declaiming Bard.³

In a very similar manner Sir Solemn Trifle is disposed of in D'Avenant's *News From Plymouth*. Here again, since Sir Solemn is rather 'de trop', Captain Seawit, in the interest of good company, makes the flattering suggestion that he might step aside into an empty gallery near by to practise a discourse, later of course to be delivered in full assembly, upon the relative merits of the Nine Worthies. Pleased with the idea, Sir Solemn withdraws, and, though his exit is less violent than Sir Formal's, the same end is achieved.

Further evidence that D'Avenant's character of Sir Solemn made an impression upon Shadwell may be found in one of his later works, *The Scourers* (1691). The play contains the figure of an alderman, Sir Humphry Maggot,⁴ who loves above all things to collect scraps of foreign news and to discuss affairs abroad. In the last act, he is forced to free his would-be rakehell nephew, Whachum, from a jail sentence because Whachum threatens to disclose certain treasonable statements made by his uncle in pursuit of his news-scavenging. Here again Shadwell recalled D'Avenant's Sir Solemn, who, in addition to being a 'professor' of rhetoric, is a great news-monger and penny politician, an 'extractor of the quint-

speech of Sir Positive At-All—generally conceded to be a caricature of Sir Robert Howard—in Shadwell's earliest play, *The Sullen Lovers* (1668). D'Avenant's play did not appear in print until the publication, in 1673, of his collected works, but Shadwell might easily have either seen the play performed, or known it in manuscript.

¹ It is barely possible that Shadwell meant to acknowledge his debt to D'Avenant, then dead almost eight years, by choosing the name Sir Formal *Trifle*, and it is only fair to Shadwell to point out that he does not specifically designate Sir Formal as one of his four 'entirely new' humours. It is admittedly difficult, however, if we omit Sir Formal, to find a fifth character in the play which deserves the name of a humour, much less a new humour.

² Compare Cockbram's offer in R. Brome's *Covent Garden Weeded* (1658), III, 1.

³ *Mac Flecknoe*, ll. 212-13.

⁴ This is the name of the character in the play, but in the *Dramatis Personae* he is given as Sir Rich. Maggot, and a little below Lady Maggot is described as *Wife to Sir Richard*.

essence' of news sheets—a residuum which he foists upon the public as rare and fresh intelligence. Building on his knowledge of Sir Solemn's activities, Topsail, another captain, bribes a porter to disguise himself as a pursuivant and to pretend an arrest on the knight's person for treasonable utterance in the news. Sir Solemn is so badly frightened that he is induced to 'vanish as in a mist', and Topsail is left free to pursue his courtship without the old knight's officious interference.

I cannot leave this matter without a word of tribute to Shadwell's genius. Whatever he may have borrowed from D'Avenant, the character of Sir Formal Trifle remains an ever-memorable figure of high fun. Placed side by side, Sir Solemn sinks into insignificance before Sir Formal, whose largeness and solidity are 'intense' enough to enlist our sympathy and misleading enough to make us forget the great native foolishness which motivates the character.

G. BLAKEMORE EVANS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

COWLEY AND WORDSWORTH'S 'SKYLARK' ('ETHEREAL MINSTREL')

Edward Dowden, in his edition of the poems of Wordsworth (Athenaeum Press Series), in a note on the well-known concluding couplet of Wordsworth's 'Skylark' ('Type of the wise who soar'...), quotes from Hogg's 'The Lark':

Thy lay is in heaven—thy love is on earth.

But I do not find any editor of Wordsworth's poems noticing in this connection the following lines (of the concluding stanza) from Cowley's poem on 'The Shortness of Life and Uncertainty of Riches' (Fragments):

The wise example of the heavenly lark,
Thy fellow-poet, Cowley's mark;
Above the clouds let thy proud music sound
Thy humble nest build on the ground.

This is perhaps the earliest expression of the same idea which is more poetically put by Wordsworth; and considering the fact that Cowley was one of the most popular poets widely read by the poets of the Romantic Revival, it may not be unreasonable to infer that Wordsworth might have taken the hint from the above lines of the earlier poet.¹

P. K. DAS.

RAJSAHI, BENGAL.

¹ Wordsworth owned a 1681 folio Cowley (see *Essay Supplementary to the Preface*, 1815).

THE DATING OF SHELLEY'S FRAGMENT, 'THE MORAL TEACHING OF
JESUS CHRIST'

Shelley's prose fragment *The Moral Teaching of Jesus Christ* was found among the Shelley manuscripts in the possession of Sir John C. E. Shelley-Rolls, Bart., and first published in the Julian Edition of Shelley's Complete Works.¹ The editor is of the opinion that the fragment seems to be connected with the *Essay on Christianity* which Mr Rossetti dates 'approximately in 1815, but Mr Koszul shows that there are evidences in the manuscript book to show that it was in use in the year 1817. and later, when Shelley's prejudices against Christianity had been re-aroused over the Chancery proceedings'.²

The evidence for the dating and the occasion for its composition make it unlikely that it belongs to the *Essay on Christianity*, though a late date of composition may not exclude the possibility that it was intended to be included in an essay of similar sentiments, the greater portion of which was written earlier. That the fragment was not written in England but in Italy is evident from the manuscript itself. 'The original' says the editor, 'is written in Shelley's hand, without a title on a sheet of foolscap paper, apparently of Italian or foreign make'.³ Within the fragment itself we get a definite clue to its approximate date. The closing sentence of the fragment runs as follows: 'The idea of forgiveness of injuries, the error of revenge, and the immorality and inutility of punishment considered as punishment, (for these <are> correlative doctrines) are stated by Plato in the first book of the *Republic*.' The reference to the first book of the *Republic* finds a parallel in Shelley's 'Fragments from the *Republic* of Plato'. In Fragment VII Shelley says, 'Plato's doctrine of punishment as laid down, p. 146, is refuted by his previous reasonings—P. 26'.⁴ The reference in the fragment *The Moral Teaching of Jesus Christ* therefore points to a date when Shelley had been reading and translating from the *Republic*, and commenting on those portions of it which deal with Plato's view on punishment. Since the date of his

¹ R. Ingpen and W. E. Peck, *The Complete Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley* (London, New York, 1929), vi, pp. 255-6. This fragment was also published in *Poetry and Prose*, edited by Sir John C. E. Shelley-Rolls, Bart., and Roger Ingpen (London, 1934), pp. 110-1. The quotation from the fragment in this note is from the latter edition.

² R. Ingpen and W. E. Peck, *op. cit.*, vi, 364.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 369.

⁴ *Ibid.*, vii, 259. The edition to which these page references refer is E. Massey, *Platonis de Republica* (Cambridge, 1713). P. 146 in this edition = 379 d6-380 c3 in Burnet's Oxford text edition of the *Republic*, and p. 26 = 335 a1-335 d11. According to Shelley Plato's doctrine, that punishment is remedial (380), is contradicted by Plato's reasonings in 335, where Socrates proves by analogy to the other arts that to hurt a human being is to make him worse in respect of human excellence.

reading and translating the fragments from the early books of the *Republic* has been shown by the writer to be probably October or November 1819¹, it is likely that the fragment on *The Moral Teaching of Jesus Christ* was composed during or after this period.

The composition of the fragment was likely to have been prompted by the trial of Richard Carlile, a publisher, who was tried in October 1819 and sentenced to three years' imprisonment besides a fine for publishing such free-thought books as Paine's *Age of Reason* and Palmer's *Principles of Nature*. Upon Carlile's conviction Shelley wrote a letter to Leigh Hunt from Florence on 3 November 1819² expressing feelings about the divinity of Jesus similar to those found in the fragment. It is probable therefore that this fragment was written in November 1819.

JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS.

HARTFORD, CONN.

A NOTE ON CORNEILLE'S 'POLYEUCTE'

Lanson defines Corneille's conception of love thus:³ 'L'amour est le désir du bien, donc réglé sur la connaissance du bien.' Une idée de la raison, donc, va gouverner l'amour. Ce que l'on aime, on l'aime pour la perfection qu'on y voit.' From this definition Lanson deduces two things: (1) that the famous Cornelian conflict between love and duty does not exist, since love itself demands that the hero do his duty; (2) that with greater enlightenment love may transfer itself from one object to another more worthy of it:

Si le bien qu'on aimait est connu pour faux, ou si on reçoit la notion d'un bien supérieur, l'âme déplacera son amour du moins parfait au plus parfait. C'est toute la psychologie de *Polyeucte*. Polyeucte aime Pauline dès le début 'cent fois plus que lui-même'; près du martyr, il l'aimera

Beaucoup moins que (son) Dieu, mais bien plus que (lui) même.

Ce nouveau terme de comparaison explique toute la transformation de son âme. Lorsqu'il connaissait mal Dieu, Pauline était tout pour lui: l'œuvre de la grâce achevée, son amour est tout à Dieu, et ne retombe sur la créature que renvoyé sous forme de charité par l'amour même de Dieu.

Même aventure arrive à Pauline: Sévère longtemps a été tout ce qu'elle connaissait de meilleur, elle l'aimait donc plus que tout. Mais Polyeucte, converti, rebelle, martyr, lui révèle un héroïsme supérieur, tandis que la situation accuse les parties vulgaires de l'amour de Sévère: l'amour de Pauline se transportera donc à Polyeucte, d'où il s'élancera jusqu'à la souveraine perfection, jusqu'à Dieu. Tout le mécanisme moral de la tragédie se déduit de la définition cartésienne et cornélienne de l'amour.

Lanson is, of course, right in saying that Cornelian tragedy is based on the optimistic belief that 'man needs must love the highest...', that

¹ J. A. Notopoulos, 'The Dating of Shelley's Notes and Translations from Plato', *Modern Language Review*, xxxiv (1939), 246. The date in this note for the entry in Mary's Journal should read 28 October 1819 instead of 1817.

² R. Ingpen, *The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley* (London, 1914), II, pp. 736-44.

³ *Histoire de la Littérature française* (14th ed., 1920, p. 435).

love is but an aspect of man's aspiration towards perfection. Nothing is so characteristic of Corneille as the readiness of his characters to acknowledge and honour perfection, whenever they see it, and even though this perfection may express itself at their own expense. Chimène praises Rodrigue's courage, which has just cost her her father's life. Pauline finds it quite natural and reasonable to ask her former lover, Sévère, to applaud the victory she has won over her own heart in marrying Polyeucte. And Sévère begs her pardon for not having recognized at once the sublime quality of her devotion to duty. Polyeucte, too, far from being offended when Pauline tells him that Sévère's presence still disturbs her profoundly, praises the virtue of his wife and pities Sévère for having lost so noble a woman.

But is Lanson right in seeing the whole Corneille in such traits as these? This much at least is certain, that when he sees Pauline in the sole light of this definition, he is led into a serious error of interpretation (and Pauline's change of heart is perhaps a more important factor in the definition than Lanson would care to admit). For Pauline's love passes from Sévère to Polyeucte, not because she recognizes in the martyr a higher nobility than that of the merely gallant Sévère, but for a far humbler reason.

Polyeucte starts off with this sole advantage over Sévère, that he is Pauline's lawful husband whom it is her duty to cherish. And that would have been sufficient in itself to ensure the ultimate, if not immediate displacement of Pauline's entire affection. Pauline's telling Sévère that he still exercises a strong fascination over her ('Un je ne sais quel charme encor vers vous m'emporte') is simply an example of Corneille's lawyer-like impartiality: he always states the case for that which is vanquished in the strongest possible terms, as if to say that the victor's triumph is complete and irrevocable, for the vanquished was as strong as he ever had been or ever would be when the two met. Thus Chimène's love for Rodrigue is at its most intense ('C'est peu de dire aimer, Elvire, je l'adore') at the very moment when she announces her resolve to pursue him relentlessly. So in *Polyeucte*, Pauline's confession to Sévère simply confirms what she has just told him:

Mais puisque mon devoir m'imposait d'autres lois,
De quelque amant pour moi que mon père eût fait choix
Quand à ce grand pouvoir que la valeur vous donne
Vous auriez ajouté l'éclat d'une couronne,
Quand je vous aurais vu, quand je l'aurais haï,
J'en aurais soupiré, mais j'aurais obéi,
Et sur mes passions ma raison souveraine
Eût blâmé mes soupirs et dissipé ma haine. (II, ii.)

The subsequent crisis simply accelerates what would have been Pauline's normal development: it serves, not to reveal to her the worth of the man she has married, but to concentrate and intensify the wifely devotion which would, in ordinary circumstances, have been spread over a whole lifetime. Polyeucte, in a spirit of bravado, from which none of Corneille's heroes are free—

Allons, mon cher Néarque, allons aux yeux des hommes
Braver l'idolâtrie, et montrer qui nous sommes,—

has celebrated his conversion to Christianity by overthrowing the altars of the false gods, and is in prison awaiting execution. Thenceforward, Polyeucte is to Pauline not only the husband to whom she is lawfully married, but also a husband whose life is in imminent danger and whom it is her duty to save.

And in her efforts to save him she never pauses to contemplate and salute the heroism which has placed him in this danger. On the contrary, it is against this very heroism that she struggles. She pays tribute, it is true, to Polyeucte's steadfastness when she tells her father, Governor Félix, not to rely on Polyeucte's changing his faith to save his life (III, iii). But it is not a disinterested tribute: she has a practical end in view: she does it simply in order to deny her father an escape from his natural duty to do something for his son-in-law. And it does not prevent her, when she fails to win a reprieve from her father, from turning next to Polyeucte and urging him to recant.

For a moment she has the patience to argue impersonally with Polyeucte, but not for long. she soon shows that she has only one argument—her own suffering ('Cruel, car il est temps que ma douleur éclate...')—and that she does not really care what Polyeucte thinks so long as his life is saved. This is made quite clear in what to me is the most significant passage in the whole play, namely that in which she urges Polyeucte simply to pretend that he has recanted, if only for a moment, until the departure of Sévère, the Emperor's all-powerful favourite, leaves Félix free to reprieve his son-in-law:

Pauline. Adorez-le dans l'âme, et n'en témoignez rien.
Polyeucte. Que je sois tout ensemble idolâtre et chrétien!
Pauline. Ne feignez qu'un moment, laissez partir Sévère
Et donnez lieu d'agir aux bontés de mon père.

In short, she urges Polyeucte to play the coward and the hypocrite to save his life. That is something very rare in a Cornelian heroine. Chimène, one has every right to suppose, would not have had Rodrigue shirk his duel with her father to save either his own or her father's life. Cinna's

unwillingness to kill a generous master infuriates Emilie, who calls it cowardice. Pauline, alone of all Corneille's women (with the possible exception of Camille, who welcomes her lover, Curiace, when, as she thinks, he has run away from the contest with her brother, Horace), prefers a living husband to a dead hero.

And when Polyeucte crowns it all by handing Pauline over to her former lover, Sévère, she is not at all impressed by this fresh display of magnanimity. At bottom, she does not believe in Polyeucte's magnanimity: to her essentially practical and matter-of-fact mind, it is simply a sign that her husband is tired of her:

C'est donc là le dégoût qu'apporte l'hyménée?
Je te suis odieuse après m'être donnée!

By this time it is obvious that Pauline's affection is no longer the mere dutifulness of Act II. It is equally obvious that what has brought about the change is not Pauline's realization of Polyeucte's superiority but the efforts she is being forced to make to save Polyeucte's life. So that Pauline's conversion to Christianity in the end, when Polyeucte has been executed, far from being, as in Lanson's interpretation, the inevitable conclusion of a constant progression of her affections (from Sévère to Polyeucte, from Polyeucte to God), is simply a conventional 'happy ending', a rather childish intrusion of Corneille's own optimistic prejudices, which would have been unsatisfied if the play had ended without the excellence of Christianity being recognized by everybody, even by the unworthy Félix.

* * * * *

At bottom, Lanson's mistake is due to the fact that his original definition was too narrow. The governing factor in the mind of man, as portrayed by Corneille, is not reason but will. It is Corneille's chief originality, it seems to me, to have seen that the joy a man finds in overcoming difficulties can become a dominant motive in his life. It would not be true, perhaps, to say that Chimène loves Rodrigue all the more that it is difficult for her to love the man who has killed her father, and it is certain that to Rodrigue the idea of having to fight Chimène's father is the least attractive part of his duty. Indeed, it is to this tempering of the will that *Le Cid* owes its particular freshness. But in the later plays there are important characters, evidently meant to be admired, who constantly prefer the path of most resistance, simply because it is the path of most resistance, not because it is the most direct way to a desirable goal. Horace is an extreme example: he thanks the gods (II, 3) that he will have to fight against his own wife's brothers and that the

task of defending his country has thus been made especially difficult for him; and in the end, when he has killed not only the three Curiaces but his sister Camille as well, he asks the King's permission to kill himself, because, having overcome the greatest obstacles a man can possibly meet in this life, he has no longer anything to live for.

Descartes, later, bases his whole psychology on this glorification of will-power, and proclaims that, 'notre volonté ne se portant à suivre ni à fuir aucune chose que selon que notre entendement la lui représente bonne ou mauvaise', the will 'fighting with its own weapons', that is uninfluenced by any of the ordinary human passions, cannot possibly lead us astray.

Descartes adapts his doctrine to the needs and powers of the average man and says that there is positive virtue in constraint, for instance, that the naturally timid man can acquire courage by making a habit of refusing to run away when he is afraid. It is something similar, it seems to me, that Corneille has said in the character of Pauline. The will, he seems to say, can induce even the most spontaneous of the passions by enforcing the line of conduct proper to that passion: Pauline, by dint of acting constantly in the capacity of a devoted wife, ends by being indeed the devoted wife.

J. HEYWOOD THOMAS.

CARDIFF.

REVIEWS

Bibliographical Description and Cataloguing. By J. D. COWLEY. London: Grafton. 1939. xii+256 pp. with 11 plates. 15s.

If it be understood that it is not a discourse on Bibliography but, as it says, on Bibliographical Description and Cataloguing, this work should prove of great assistance to everyone concerned with these subjects—and not to beginners only, for the author endeavours to cover the whole field in considerable detail. This he is able to do in moderate compass by leaving answers to the more technical questions to be sought in professed ‘handbooks’ of bibliography: for example, he has nothing to say about determining folding and format, but contents himself with guidance how and where the facts should be recorded. His instructions are generally minute and explicit, and if they sometimes appear dogmatic, we must remember that no one could possibly lay down rules on such a subject that would be universally accepted, or that would not be even violently rejected by some at least of his fellow-workers. The great value of Mr Cowley’s work seems to me to lie in the fact that he freely records and discusses the methods employed by other writers both past and present, showing what he considers the strong and weak points in their systems; and further that he illustrates his argument with lavish examples of descriptions of actual books. Indeed students may find Mr Cowley more useful as a shrewd guide and expositor of the various problems that arise in the description of books, and of the various ways of tackling them, than as a legislator laying down a definite code for their guidance. But one might truly say this of most books of this kind; and for my own part I incline to think that the only real help one can give to the descriptive bibliographer is just this of putting before him the various matters that present themselves for consideration, explaining the several possible ways of dealing with them, and then leaving him to construct for himself the system best suited to the needs of his own particular task. In so far as he has done this Mr Cowley’s book is excellent. At the same time he does occasionally lay down what appear to me quite arbitrary rules. For example, he directs that, in recording the contents of a book, the bibliographer shall first specify the pages and then the matter printed on them; he does not so much as mention the alternative (and as some hold preferable) method of enumerating the various contents and adding references to the pages they occupy. Thus he begins a description: ‘F. [1 a] T. p.; [1 b] Blank’; where many would prefer to write: ‘Title, A1 (verso blank)’. Occasionally, too, the directions seem to me trivial to the point of impertinence: thus ‘Interpolations [i.e. editorial explanations in the transcript of a title] to be capitalized only when following a period’. Surely this is a matter best left to the taste of the describer. But if a rule must be laid down, this seems the worst possible. Such interpolations have no relation to the grammatical construction of the title, and their

form should not be conditioned by it: personally I should never capitalize such notes as '[within rules]', '[ornament]', etc.

In a preliminary chapter Mr Cowley appears to distinguish three branches of bibliography: the investigation of the transmission of texts, the history of book-production, and the description or cataloguing of books. His analysis, however, does not seem to me altogether clear—mainly, I fancy, from the usual failure to distinguish between bibliography and 'bibliographies'. I suspect that he included the first branch out of deference to myself, and I take it as a compliment: but when he seems to imply that this is the only branch that I recognize, I feel bound to protest. Of course, historical bibliography is a branch of bibliography—and a very important one, though not, in my opinion, that which lends the study its real significance. So, too, is book-description properly understood. That is to say, the description of a book is certainly a bibliographical function: what, I contend, has (generally) nothing to do with bibliography is the determining of what books shall be described or 'the analysis of the subject-matter'.

Into the details of the chapters that follow it is, of course, quite impossible to enter here. Mr Cowley is far too modest to expect that any reader will agree with all his recommendations. On many points I heartily disagree. There is, for instance, on p. 144 the astounding assertion that 'Manuscripts do not properly form the material of a bibliography'! In the chapter on editing the advice given seems to me at times unfortunate. A careful bibliographer, transcribing a title, will copy capitals and small-caps as they stand, rather than rely on a clumsy system of underscoring; this he will reserve for the distinction of italic and black letter only. 'Two proofs, one in galley and one in page, should be supplied by the printer', is naive and rather misleading, since it suggests their being supplied simultaneously: of course, proofs should be read in galley before going into pages, but more than one successive proof of each stage may well be required. 'In making up page proofs the printer will probably supply headlines, taking the title from the chapter and section headings.' Probably—but very likely wrongly. Any author worth his salt will give the printer proper directions on the point. In the generally admirable title-transcripts there are a few readings that look like slips, such as 'unto' and 'Flevrs' on pp. 23 and 25; there are also one or two errors in the summary of my *Formulary of Collation* for which I do not think I am responsible. Lastly, it is unfortunate, in a work of this kind, that the printer should not have had a wider selection of sorts: an inverted '£' is hardly a satisfactory rendering of a black-letter ampersand; and, in any case, when the transcript is being made in roman type, the ampersand is most naturally rendered by '&' (though incunabulists are inclined to make a distinction). I may mention that the practice of printing advertisements separately, ascribed on p. 40 to the nineteenth century, is at least as old as the middle of the seventeenth.

Mr Cowley's work is obviously the outcome of extensive experience and familiarity alike with the methods of other bibliographers and, what is even more important, with all sorts and conditions of originals. As

such it should prove most stimulating and helpful to all whose business it is to describe and catalogue books, though the excessive amount of detail and extraneous information he sometimes appears to demand in the record may well prove discouraging to the beginner. On the other hand, the judgments to which his experience has led him do not command complete confidence: they are not, to my thinking, always deeply reasoned or the fruit of great critical insight.

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

The Place-Names of Wiltshire. By J. E. B. GOVER, ALLEN MAWER and F. M. STENTON. (*English Place-Name Society*, vol. XVI.) Cambridge: University Press. 1939. xli+547 pp. 22s. 6d

In reviewing the sixteenth volume of the Place-Name Society publications it is unnecessary to make general statements on the importance of the work and the care with which it is carried out, for this has been often said already. It is sufficient to say that the present volume does not fall below the high standard of its predecessors and that like these it sheds light on many branches of learning.

A particular interest is given to this county by the survival of so many charters from the Old English period, often with detailed boundaries, with the result that an unusually large proportion of names, even of minor places, can be taken back to pre-Conquest forms. One is struck again and again with the extraordinary persistence of local nomenclature over many centuries, a remarkable instance being the occurrence in Rodbourne Cheney of the field names Broad Way, Filks and Haddington representing the *bradan weg*, *filcan slæd*, *headdan dune* of the Old English boundaries of BCS 1093, dated 962 (not BCS 788, of 943, as stated p. 458). The work of Dr G. B. Grundy on Wiltshire charters had already made many identifications, and this help and that of several other scholars, including local antiquaries, is acknowledged in the preface.

The chief features of general interest are discussed in the introduction. One naturally turns to the place-names of this county for evidence relating to the settlement of Wessex and to the relations of the English with the Celtic population. On this first question it is pointed out that the names are not at variance with the dates in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, i.e. mid-sixth century, for names suggestive of a fifth-century settlement are absent. A small group of heathen names is said to show an occupation while 'Saxon heathenism was an active force', but, though I should not demur at this general statement, one or two of the instances brought forward in this connexion are not quite convincing. Waden Hill (*wēoh-dūn*) overlooks the prehistoric stone-circle of Avebury and could have been given a name meaning 'heathen sanctuary' in Christian times, and the name of Woden, or his byname Grim, could have been attached to earthworks or other remains considered to be of supernatural origin after he had come to be regarded as a demon, not a god. Such names would then be parallel to Devil's Den (p. 308) and to Devil's Dyke, etc., in other counties.

The Celtic element is discussed on pp. xv-xvi, and the names of this origin collected on p. 415. Crouchston (p. 392) should be added to these. This element is considerable in Wiltshire, and, as elsewhere, it is the names of natural features, not settlements, that have affected the nomenclature of the district. It seems probable that a few words, *penn*, *chet*, *cors*, *idover*, were adopted as common nouns into Old English. Occurrences of *weala*, *brytta*, 'Britons' (gen. pl.) are noted.

In a brief introduction it was naturally not possible to include all the interesting material in the survey, or to do more than touch on some points of interest. In a county so thick with archaeological remains the naming of these at different times is worth noting. Foremost of course comes Stonehenge, which in the text, p. 360, is plausibly connected with O.E. *hen(c)gen*, 'gallows, torture-rack', while the reference to Wace supplied by Professor Dickins on p. xl shows that, if this is correct, popular etymology was very early at work with this name. Wansdyke and the three instances of Grim's Ditch are early names of prehistoric remains with reference to Woden; the Devil's Den (p. 308), a chamber tomb, Giant's Cave (p. 77), two instances of Giant's Grave, one (p. 326) referring to an entrenchment, the other (p. 350) to a long barrow, represent a later strata; *wodnesbeorge* as the name of a barrow was replaced later by Adam's Grave (p. 318), and Robin Hood's Ball (p. 331) is probably another instance of the tendency to connect such remains with famous legendary characters. Chisbury (p. 334), an ancient earthwork, has its explanatory legend as early as the mid-twelfth-century *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*. Further material is collected under *beorg* (pp. 404, 423), *burh* (pp. 405, 424), *byrgels* (p. 425), and we should add to this *Kyngberewe* (p. 460) and *Babbeborowe* (p. 481), which preserves the name of the Old English occupant or owner as late as 1454. The not infrequent 'broken barrows' (pp. 53 f., 423) and 'rough barrows' (pp. 30, 242, 423) may apply to tumuli that had been rifled. Interesting references to Roman remains, other than roads, occur under *ceastel*, *stanceastel* (p. 426), while the name Cock-a-Troop (p. 301), from *Crokerestroke*, 'hamlet of the crocker or maker of pots', is probably due to the sherds turned up on the Roman site nearby.

Is it because of its many prehistoric remains that Wiltshire has been such a haunted county? Besides the 'Grim's' and 'devil's' mentioned above, there are thirteen places, *Pukputt* (p. 40), Poughcombe (p. 304), Puck Shipton (p. 319), Pugnits Copse and *Puckmead* (p. 387), *Pukpole* (p. 444), *Pookcroft*, *Puck Hay* and *Pockeridge* (p. 444), *Pukeputte* (p. 445), *Pukeburne* (p. 459), Pook's Lane (p. 491), Pugnits (p. 506), with the element *pūca*, 'a goblin', and one, Pucklechurch (p. 495), which probably has the diminutive *pūcel*. Scratchbury Hill (p. 154) probably contains a West Country name for the devil and Bugley (p. 158) may have M.E. *bugge*, 'a goblin'. *Scinneresmore* (p. 442) is mentioned in 1224 and contains O.E. *scinnere*, 'a wizard'. Two places, Wormcliff and Wormwood Farm (p. 85), were associated with a dragon (O.E. *wyrm*), while another of these creatures presumably, like those in *Beowulf*, guarded buried gold, for Drake North (p. 400) occurs as *drakenhorde* in 940-6. Another

Beowulfian monster haunted a pool in this county, i.e. the water monster, *nicor*, of *Nikerpole* (pp. 444, 499), and it is in Wiltshire that the *Grendlesmere* of BCS 677 is to be located (p. 441). These reminders of the *Beowulf* story gain additional interest from the fact that the name *Beowulf* itself has been found to occur in another part of Wessex, namely in Belbury Castle (*Place-Names of Devon*, II, 604), where *bigulfesburh* refers to an old earthwork and may, like Robin Hood's Ball above, be due to association with a figure of legend. The occurrence in Wiltshire of the heroic names *Fritela* (p. 330), *Hoc* (p. 425), *Geat* (p. 264), and possibly *Hunlaf* (p. 71), should also be noted.

Attention might also be drawn to the interest of the volume for the study of legal antiquities. Litigation is implied by the elements *cheste* (pp. 125, 437), *flit* (p. 432), *sakene* (p. 433), *stroute* (O.E. *strūt*) (p. 437), *wrōht* (p. 448). Two further instances of O.E. *morgengifu* occur (pp. 186, 428), of which the former may refer to a *morgengifu* actually mentioned in about 915. Damerham (*dōmera hamm*) seems to refer to some kind of court. Foghamshire in Chippenham (p. 90) apparently uses *shire* in the same sense as the Domesday Survey of the city of York (DB, fol. 298), i.e. as a division of a town.

It would also be possible to point out the service rendered by this volume in supplying a full series of forms of place-names that occur in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and thus helping their more certain identification, as for example the *Iglea* of 878 (p. 155) and the *Caneganmersc* of 1010 (pp. 249 f.); or the contributions to the study of English vocabulary such as the early instances of *poultry* (p. 21), *cockroad* (p. 427), *tucking mill* (p. 442), of new words like those mentioned on p. xvii or *chiperie* (p. 20), but to do this fully would swell this review to an inordinate length.

Enough has been said to show the importance of the volume for scholars in many subjects. While appreciating the great difficulty of compressing so much matter into a single volume, one wonders whether something more could not be done to make it less difficult for the reader to extract the type of information he is seeking. This applies with especial force to the field-name material, for these names are not included in the index and even facts as interesting as another occurrence of the 'mysterious' name *Billerica* (p. 482) might easily escape notice. In particular the discontinuing of the list of personal names occurring in field-names which was given in previous volumes up to and including Surrey is greatly to be regretted. To the student of personal names these are no less interesting if they occur in minor names. In the present volume the list would hardly have occupied a page and would have included early names such as *Babba*, *Bacga*, *Bubba*, *Hoc*, *Mocca*, the rather rare later names *Cypping* and *Smeawine*, and would have added three O.E. names of women to the number mentioned on p. xix, exclusive of certain or probable saints' names. Incidentally, may we not have in the *Bacga* of Bacon Hill in Alderton (p. 465) the man who gave his name to Back Bridge (*Baggebrugge*) near Malmesbury (p. 49) and so be able to add another instance to those on p. xix of one individual naming two places?

It is doubtless because of the exigencies of space that philological explanation is reduced to a minimum. In a few places it would have been better to give a little further assistance. For example, the [tʃ] of Crouch Hill (p. 26), Crouchston (p. 392) seems to me to require some explanation; the same element appears with [k] in Crook Hill (p. 201) and Crookwood (p. 315), which is what one would expect after a back vowel. The interchange between *e* and *o* in Were (p. 10) and the early forms of Warminster (p. 157) is explained by reference to Ekwall (*River Names*, p. 450), where this and the similar interchange between *Wodnes-*, *Wednes-* is held to point to a development of *o* to *e* after *w*. But surely the unrounding of a rounded vowel after a rounded consonant is phonologically improbable and the alternative suggestion of a suffix-ablaut (see *N.E.D.* s.v. *Wednesday*) should at least have been mentioned. Many disturbances of normal development are clearly due to popular etymology, e.g. Sundeys Hill (p. 66), Swancombe (p. 167), Chislebury (p. 215), Roundway (p. 253), Woodhill (p. 267), but how does one account for the *o* in Notton (p. 103), if from *nēat-tūn*, or for *ou* in Choulden (*chealfa dune*)? In this last case one would have liked to know the local pronunciation. Some phonological discussions, notably that of Grovely (p. 13), would have been much clearer if the Clarendon type used had vowel quantity marked. In view of the frequency of [aɪ] in modern forms of names containing O.E. *yfer*, the explanation of Iver, etc., as due to spelling pronunciation (*Place-Names of Buckinghamshire*, p. 240) becomes more difficult to accept, and perhaps with Clark-Hall (*A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*) we should give this word a long vowel in Old English.

DOROTHY WHITELOCK.

OXFORD.

Histoire de la forme périphrastique être + participe présent en germanique.

Par FERNAND MOSSÉ (*Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, tomes XLII, XLIII.) 1^{re} partie: *Introduction, Ancien germanique, Vieil-anglais*. 2^e partie: *Moyen-anglais et Anglais moderne*. Paris: Klincksieck. 1938. 126 pp., xi + 301 pp. 40 fr., 85 fr.

This is an extraordinarily interesting and competent study of a complex point—the growth in English of the periphrastic form made up of the verb ‘to be’ followed by a present participle.

As M. Mossé points out, grammarians from the seventeenth century to the present day have concerned themselves with this formation; it has been discussed and dissected, and in particular its use in Modern English has been the subject of interest. But no one has previously attempted to trace the history of the form throughout the history of English; because it seems to occur much less frequently in Middle English than in Modern, its importance at an earlier date has been underestimated, and, as the author puts it, ‘on a cherché à établir les principes psychologiques qui régissent l’emploi de ces formes sans tenir assez compte de traditions qui remontent loin dans le passé’.

Such lack of interest in past history of the form has also led previous writers to neglect what might seem a suspiciously close analogy between, for instance, O.E. *was feohtende* and Mod. Eng. *was fighting*. Any possible connexion between the two has been minimized or ignored, and the modern form regarded as of Middle English origin; this theory M. Mossé endeavours to disprove, in the first volume of his work, by assembling and analysing all possible evidence in Germanic in its older stages, and particularly in Old English.

The periphrastic form, used to express duration in all its aspects, occurs in most of the important Indo-Germanic languages, and in Germanic also, though only English of the modern Germanic tongues retains it. Its presence in Old English M. Mossé suggests, with good reason, to be due to Latin influence; however that may be, one important fact is the already bewildering use of the periphrastic form in Old English.

The second volume is an extension and amplification of the first, continuing the history to modern times. There is no doubt at all that M. Mossé has made out a strong case for continuity of the form from Old English to the present day; its rarity in early Middle English may surely be explained by the nature of the literary remains of that period.

It is hardly possible to review in short space a work of this kind, where there is so much of interest that yet has to be subordinated to the main discussion; but one can recommend every teacher of the English language to study these sections on the value of verbal prefixes and on the relation between the endings *-end* and *-ing*. The last part is an attempt to reduce to order, under 'la durée subjective', 'la durée objective', and 'emplois divers', the infinite variety of the periphrastic form in Modern English.

With such riches, it seems hardly fair to criticize; and such faults as have been found are, like the famous baby, only little ones. In spite of the considerable list of errata, a few misprints remain—e.g. in vol. I, § 249, the first quotation and its English rendering do not correspond: vol. II, p. 196, last line, *Terens* should be *Tereus*. It may be noted that there is a somewhat annoying likeness between *t* and *l*, which makes close scrutiny of many quotations necessary; there are also several gaps in lettering. The graph on p. 125, giving the relative frequency of *I am a-doing* and *I am doing*, is very interesting and full, but it is not stated which line refers to which phrase, and the descriptive letter-press might apply to either. The bibliography on the Lindisfarne Gospels does not include Mr A. S. C. Ross's *Studies* (1937). How far the evidence of Middle Scots may be taken (p. 91) for the change of *in* to *ing* is doubtful, especially such texts as *Lancelot of the Laik* and *The Kingis Quair*. Finally, *scepen* in Caedmon's Hymn can hardly be regarded as from O.E. *sceppend* (p. 88); cf. A. H. Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 39 n.

ANGUS MACDONALD.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

On Rereading Chaucer. By HOWARD ROLLIN PATCH. Cambridge, Mass : Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1939. xii + 258 pp. 10s. 6d.

On Rereading Chaucer is a welcome addition to the full-length critical studies of the poet by scholars. It is chiefly concerned with Chaucer's quality of 'humor . . . or a healthy mind, or kindliness, or whatever it is we all find irresistible in the man', and critic and theme are clearly well met. Other topics are the poet's realism (even as an allegorist 'he obviously carried reality in his head'), his reputed cynicism (non-existent), his satire (evidently not designed to reform vices by ridicule), his irony (more widespread than has been observed), his attitude to medieval romance, determinism, the *Divine Comedy*, sublimity, pathos, the common people, youth, women, and his *dramatis personae* in general. Two discussions are outstanding: one on the significance of *Troilus and Criseyde*, the other on the characters of the Canterbury pilgrims. There are also many stimulating questions, some of which are left unanswered. For instance: 'Why did Chaucer deal chiefly or most convincingly with women marked by Cressid's weakness?' Why did he adopt the pose of luckless lover? Was he in the late 'seventies preoccupied with moral stories? What enabled him to look on this dirty world so cheerfully? Did Troilus's lack of forthright masculinity make it easier for Criseyde to move elsewhere, and does that weakness in the hero constitute the Aristotelean 'tragic flaw'? Those who desire to probe deeper into the secret of Chaucer's enviable philosophy will find the book at once illuminating and provocative. Its author hoped to elicit 'differing views' and no doubt will not be disappointed. A few may be offered now on points which seem important.

Dr Patch sees allusions to court life in the *Parliament of Fowls*, the *House of Fame*, the *Legend of Good Women*, and the passages on the poet's unluckiness in love. Recent findings confirm this conclusion in principle, but challenge it in every particular proposed. The result is that all Dr Patch's attempts at historical interpretation seem to be barking up the wrong branches of the right tree. It is to be hoped that they will be compared with Haldeen Braddy's articles of several years ago on the *Parliament* and with my own article on *Chaucer's Sovereign Lady* which appeared in this periodical in April 1938.

The last-named study cites evidences for thinking that the *Canterbury Tales*, like the *Divine Comedy*, is an expression of religious faith, and that in the form and content of the poem, perhaps deliberately, Chaucer opposes to Dante's vision of God enthroned in white light his own sense that 'God's dwelling-place is *with men*'. Dr Patch declares that there is 'no slightest trace of evidence' concerning Chaucer's religious development, and no sign in the *Canterbury Tales* that he had any of Dante's spiritual penetration. He suggests, however, that Chaucer was something of a Puritan; that he disapproved of the illicit love of Troilus and Criseyde; the kind he admired was the wedded love of Griselda and Dorigen. This opinion is largely based on the verse at the end of the *Troilus* which exhorts young people to 'repeyreth hom fro worldly vanyte' to the

love of God as revealed in the Cross. One questions here whether the illicitness of the relation between Troilus and Criseyde has any fundamental relevance, or had for Chaucer. May it not rather be that he characterized it as 'worldly vanity' because, lovely as it appeared at its best, it was not really love, so that its doors did not open on what Christian thinkers know to be the only 'home' of the human spirit? Chaucer confesses that he could not bring himself to condemn Criseyde, whose sin against Love was akin to Peter's denial, and surely he did not condemn Troilus, who became 'the friendhest wight', one of those, that is, who are 'born of God' and worthy, in the poet's opinion, to be translated to the eighth sphere. But however numerous or radical the differing views evoked, they are likely to be outweighed by appreciation, not least of the author's well-exercised capacity for pricking bubbles of nonsense.

MARGARET GALWAY.

LONDON.

Tudor Puritanism. By M. M. KNAPPEN. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1939. xii+555 pp. 25s.

This handsome volume is a monumental piece of scholarship, but, unlike other monuments, it is no doubt one of its primary and certainly one of its destined functions to serve as a quarry. It is a very fully documented survey of the Puritan movement up to 1603, which, by tracing the history of the cause from Henry VIII's time, produces an explanation of its different phases, and a clear account of its theory and practice.

Professor Knappen is a historian, and has confined himself to the religious writings, without drawing on the literature of the period, but his work recalls that of Louis B. Wright in its scope and method. In his first part he describes 'Party History and Theory', the internationalism of the earlier Puritans, the dominance of continental thought, the disastrous failure in co-operation at the period of Elizabeth's accession, which enabled the secular power to maintain its control. He goes on to show the larger issues behind the Vestarian controversy, and the ups and downs of the struggle during the later years of Elizabeth, with the final failure to achieve co-operation, and the 'Stuart bankruptcy'. Sectarianism and the doctrine of passive resistance had inevitably stultified the efforts of a party which was condemned to play so consistently the role of Her Majesty's Opposition.

In Part II ('Intellectual, Social and Cultural Aspects') Professor Knappen discusses such subjects as the authority of the Bible, views of predestination, devotional habits, social and economic outlook, sabbatarianism, domestic life, and education.

His general thesis supports the revolt of scholars against the sharp distinction between Middle Ages and Renaissance, and he stresses the continuity of medieval and sixteenth-century thought. In some chapters of Part II this lends a touch of special pleading to his writing, e.g. in the

chapter on Asceticism. He has, however, frankly acknowledged and warned the reader against this 'bias' in the Preface (p. vii); in general, the book is strictly objective. Indeed, it errs, if at all, on the side of 'thinking too precisely', and the general reader may lose himself among the trees without discovering the wood. The great mass of material which is here presented (largely in the form of actual quotations) stimulates the reader's appetite, but takes a good deal of digesting: it is all solid vitamins, but the weak human craving for risky but elegant little sauces and entremets is completely and Puritanically repressed. However, thanks to Professor Knappen, it is now possible to follow the fortunes of the Puritan cause year by year and often week by week. In Part II the lack of theorizing is perhaps felt more strongly than in Part I, as the very nature of the subject is in itself more analytical than the chronological survey of the preceding section.

The material makes it quite plain, however, that attempts to generalize about Puritanism must take account of the great divergences between different sections of the party, and of the fact that the Puritans were not always conscious of the implications of their own attitude. Thus he considers that, contrary to a school of thought which is very flourishing at the moment, 'the contributions of Puritanism to the rise of modern capitalism were exceedingly indirect' (p. 422) and amount practically only to a more acquiescent attitude than that of the older faith.

It would be ungrateful to criticize so valuable a work, but a few suggestions and notes may be added. A subject-index, though difficult to compile, would have been an addition to the very full critical apparatus provided. (The bibliography includes about two hundred items, and there is in the course of the work full reference to much interesting manuscript material.) In Part II, the figure of Richard Greenham seems at times to be given undue prominence; his work is largely used in Chapter XVII, his life described at length in Chapter XX, and he again supplies much of the material for Chapters XXI and XXII. On p. 392 there is a reference to the fifth edition of *A Garden of Spiritual Flowers* (1609), but the date of the edition quoted on the next page is given as 1667. It may be worth noting that the curious phrase that Christ 'passed through the Blessed Virgin Mary as saffron does through a bag' (see p. 372) was not only the property of the Anabaptists but also attributed to Hugh Latimer (*Sermon on the Ploughers*, 1549: Arber's English Reprints, 1868, p. 18).

M. C. BRADBROOK.

CAMBRIDGE.

A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure. Edited by HERBERT W. HARTMAN. London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1938. xxxiv + 327 pp. 25s.

The most surprising thing about Pettie's *Pallace* is that it may still be read with pleasure. It is strange that a very recent development of what may be termed the old rag-bag type of novel, stuffed with a miscellaneous load of observations and impressions, can reconcile a modern reader to

'the strenuous designs of latticed prose' of the earliest English novels, in a way which might have been impossible even twenty years ago. For all its elaborate variations on well-worn saws (well-worn in the sixteenth century and almost threadbare to-day), there remains in the *Pallace* a sufficient number of pertinent comments to make the work readable by those who, like the 'gentle Gentlewomen' who first turned its pages, approach it with more than an eye for style alone.

Not that Pettie can claim merit as a pure narrator. He is content to borrow his plots from Ovid, Livy, Hyginus, Castiglione, and many others, and he is woefully unaware of the first principles of selection or emphasis. Yet the laboured accuracy of the following passage, to take only one example, although reading almost like a parody of Proust, certainly displays more than a passing interest in human behaviour:

For as the finest meates that bee, eaten by one in extremity of sicknesse, resolve not to pure bloud to strengthen the body, but to watrish humors to feede the fever and disease: so though her face and lookes were fine and sweete, and brought delight to all the beholders els, yet to him they wrought onely torment and trouble of minde: and notwithstanding hee perceived her beauty to breed his bane, & her lookes to procure the losse of his liberty...yet could he not refrain his eyes from beholding her, but according to the nature of the sickly patient, which cheifly desireth that which cheiflye is forbidden him, hee so meessantly threw his amarous glaunces towards her....

And before passing to the prevalent 'euphuism' of the style, it may be well to cite one instance of Pettie's occasional use of good idiomatic speech, a certain liveliness of movement more characteristic of his coney-catching successors:

...in came *Itys* the prety elfe beeing two or three yeeres of age, and seeing his mother sit sadly sayd unto her, Mam how doost, why doest, weepe, and tooke her about the necke and kist her, saying, I will goe and call my dad to come and play with thee... the infant rose agame, and came run dugling to her saying, why do you beate me mam, I have learned my Criscrosse today so I have, and my father sayth hee wil buie mee a golden coate, and then you shannot kisse mee so you shannot....

'At a time when proverbial wisdom was in the air,' writes Professor Hartman, 'sitters in the sun bettered their grandsires' maxims and beldames quoted Seneca unwittingly.' Pettie's thieving of 'sentences' is shameless, simply because to the writer or adapter of *novelle* no shame could be attributed to such deliberate anthologizing. Just as a young law student, a century and a half later, read the pastorals of Fontenelle 'with a design to collect some little hints for conversation with the ladies', so Pettie's public would read and re-read the elegant passages between hesitant lovers, and copy down gems from the abundant correspondence. Pettie's *exempla* were lifted from many varied sources (it is interesting to note how many came direct from Heywood's *Dialogue conteynyng the number of the effectuall proverbes in the Englsche tounge*, 1546), and the editor chases this 'ubiquitous pollen of humanism' with a scholarship almost gay in its ease and scope. Indeed, there can rarely have been a sounder edition of an early text established with so infectious an enthusiasm.

Professor Hartman's edition is made from a perfect copy (Mr Carl H. Pforzheimer, formerly Britwell collection) of the first (1576) edition; variant readings from the unique (Rosenbach) copy of the second edition, followed substantially by later editions, seem to indicate that Richard Watkins, who printed the 1576 *Pallace*, was telling the truth when he admitted that the author 'was not wylling to have it common'. But whether the *Pallace* was pirated or not, it antedates *Euphues* by several years, and its extravagances of patterned speech ('O heavens why heape you my heavinessse? O planets why plant you my paine?') no less than its more acceptable alliterative vigour ('lastly in olde age wee covetously carke for coine, wee toyle for trashe'), uphold Pettie's claim to stand beside Lyly as at least the godfather of 'euphuism'.

S. GORLEY PUTT.

BELFAST.

The Tragedy of Hamlet, a critical edition of the Second Quarto, 1604, with introduction and textual notes. By T. M. PARROTT and H. CRAIG. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1938. x+247 pp. 16s.

Professor Parrott and Professor Craig have produced what is probably the most serviceable edition of *Hamlet*, on the purely textual side, that the student who is not prepared to collate all the primary texts for himself could have before him. Below a well-set-out text stands a very accurate and full textual apparatus. When the student has added in the margin of every page the Act and Scene numberings he will have an edition that it is a pleasure to use.

In addition to the care and pains they have bestowed on their task the American editors have been most generous in their recognition of recent work on *Hamlet* in England. It is unfortunate therefore that to the very generous enthusiasm that has prompted these acknowledgments must be attributed the really serious fault in their own edition.

The editors describe their text as 'a critical edition of the Second Quarto', for to read the *Hamlet* that Shakespeare wrote, they tell us, 'we must revert to the "true and perfect copy", the Second Quarto'. With this in mind they have laid down in their Preface the following rule for themselves:

The editors have retained on principle the Quarto text wherever it makes sense, refusing to accept a Folio reading which may seem to modern ears more poetic or even more significant.

And to leave no doubt about what they consider the proper procedure, they place these words on the last page of their Introduction:

The duty of a modern editor, then, a duty not fully realized until Wilson's epoch-making work on the text of *Hamlet*, is to follow Q₂ wherever possible.¹

¹ This is not, it should be noted, Professor Dover Wilson's view of his own practice. In his *Richard II* he says: 'This is not to say that I have not at times adopted readings from the Folio text. But I have departed from those of Q only when F presents an alternative both manifestly superior on aesthetic grounds and justifiable from the bibliographical standpoint.' Compare *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's Hamlet*, p. 177.

It is not too much to say that no student can really profit by this very helpful edition till he realizes the fundamental fallacy in these statements, and till he convinces himself that the editors themselves do not in the body of their work allow their critical faculty to be cut off for this shibboleth.

On this point the student will find the guidance he needs from Housman:

Open a modern recension of a classic, turn to the preface, and there you may almost count on finding, in Latin or German or English, some words like these: 'I have made it my rule to follow *a* wherever possible, and only where its readings are patently erroneous have I had recourse to *b* or *c* or *d*.'

And Housman then proceeds to demonstrate its fallacy:

Either *a* is the source of *b* and *c* and *d* or it is not. If it is, then never in any case should recourse be had to *b* or *c* or *d*. If it is not, then the rule is irrational; for it involves the assumption that wherever *a*'s scribes made a mistake they produced an impossible reading.

Three minutes' thought, as he says, should be sufficient to find this out; and the point cannot be turned by saying that though it applies to classical texts it has no bearing on Shakespeare's. For the editors do not claim that *Q*₁, or *F*₁, are copies of *Q*₂. *Q*₂ is printed, they argue (p. 45), from Shakespeare's 'original unrevised unabridged manuscript', while the Folio is from a first revision of this original for acting purposes. The Folio then, though perhaps one remove further from the original manuscript than *Q*₂, is in no sense a copy of the latter and indeed includes matter omitted from it. It is therefore an independent though less satisfactory witness to what Shakespeare originally wrote. To suppose, however, that we must ignore it except when *Q*₂ is patently in error is to run counter to the common sense rules of evidence, to assume that *Q*₂ (the work of 'an ignorant printer and somewhat rash corrector dealing with peculiarly difficult copy', see p. 48) whenever in error gives an impossible reading—in short to put aside probabilities in the most unscientific manner possible.

Of course in practice the editors ignore their own rule. They do not read:

Like quilts upon the fearful porpentine (I, v, 20).
 Neither a borrower nor a lender boy (I, iii, 75).
 What's Hecuba to him, or he to her (II, ii, 585)
 Very like, stay'd it long (I, ii, 237).

Though the Quarto readings 'make sense', they prefer the Folio reading in each place for critical reasons, that is 'for pertinent considerations, considerations of sense or usage or palaeography'. Those who wish to study their procedure in a little more detail cannot do better than pick out their notes dealing with Hamlet's trick of repeating a word or phrase, illustrated in the last example quoted above. Why, therefore, the editors should begin by laying down a rule that disables the very judgment they have to exercise in the sequel would be one of the mysteries of thought, did we not know that in this, as in other human activities, fashion may overrule common sense.

The next most unsatisfactory feature of their edition is their treatment of the punctuation. This is a difficult and controversial matter, but their note at i. i. 138 shows, as is clear elsewhere, that they have no coherent view of the matter.

Q has a full stop after DEATH. In Elizabethan printing a period often appears where we should set a comma. F puts the whole line in parenthesis. The comma of Q₁ probably represents Shakespeare's intentions.

The logic of this note is not an unfair index of their grip on this particular feature of their text.

These are the weaknesses of an edition on which great care and consideration has been bestowed; and it should be added that the main error in their textual theorizing has been offset by the practical common sense of the editors. For their work as a whole there can be nothing but praise and a ready welcome, since their edition will prove a very real help to every student who uses it.

PETER ALEXANDER.

GLASGOW.

Shakespeare's Hamlet, the Second Quarto, 1604. Reproduced in facsimile from the copy in the Huntington Library. With an introduction by Professor O. J. CAMPBELL. San Marino, California. 1938. Pp. 16 + 101 pp. in collotype. \$3.50 (or with the First Quarto, \$5.00). London: H. Milford. 16s. net.

This collotype facsimile is from the same copy as that used by Griggs for his photolithographic reproduction, a quarto formerly in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire, now in the Huntington Library, California.

Though the Griggs facsimile (and its companions) came as a boon to the student of the text, the new facsimile is an incomparably safer instrument to work with. Yet on comparing the two versions one is not surprised that the former (e.g. p. 31 'fee.', p. 30 'lunacie': though such a blot as p. 28 'other.' is inexcusable) leaves one frequently in doubt, for the collotype shows how hard the original often is to reproduce clearly.

Professor Campbell provides a short and useful introduction. One wishes, however, that he had set out all the variants in the six extant copies of this quarto. They are of course to be found, as his note indicates, in Professor Dover Wilson's *Manuscript of Shakespeare's Hamlet*, but even there Professor Dover Wilson is not satisfied with his report on the Folger copy.

The facsimile has no act, scene, or line numberings in the margin. But the student who cannot go to the trouble of putting these in for himself (and he can number the lines to suit the edition he himself prefers to work with) does not deserve to possess a copy of this excellent production.

PETER ALEXANDER.

GLASGOW.

King Lear, The Merchant of Venice, The Merry Wives of Windsor (Shakespeare Quarto facsimiles: nos. 1, 2 and 3). London: The Shakespeare Association and Sidgwick & Jackson. 1939. 10s. 6d. each.

It was Edward Capell who in 1768 first drew attention to the importance of the Quartos by his claim that they were 'set out' by Shakespeare himself, and although modern scholarship can see no reason for believing that the poet had anything to do with them, the fact that eight of the Quartos were used, with or without additions, corrections and alterations, for constructing the text of the First Folio is sufficient to render them indispensable to the modern editor, bound as he is by present-day standards to consult all the early texts. This can obviously be done more conveniently with facsimiles at home than by viewing the rare originals in public libraries. Accordingly, as early as 1778, George Steevens issued a reprint of eighteen quartos, J. O. Halliwell issued several facsimiles in 1860 at the prohibitive price of 5 guineas each, and between 1880 and 1889 forty-three photo-lithographic facsimiles were executed by Griggs and Praetorius under the superintendence of F. J. Furnivall. These latter, in spite of the value of P. A. Daniel's introductions to some of the volumes, were so inaccurate as facsimiles that they have been of little use to scholars. Since their time the few isolated facsimiles which have appeared have all been done in collotype, a process which reproduces as nearly as possible the exact appearance of the original copy, with all its blots and blemishes—helpful sometimes in solving problems. This is the process employed in the present series. Line numberings have been added in the margins for the convenience of students. The series represents the most up-to-date achievement of technical and bibliographical knowledge, and the first three volumes are sure of a welcome. Each has a brief introduction by W. W. Greg. The *Lear* is facsimiled from the Gorhambury copy of the 'Pied Bull' quarto, 1608, the *genuine* First edition (there was another with a 'faked' date 1608); the *Merchant of Venice* is from the Roxburghe copy of the Hayes quarto, 1600; it is one of the three quartos whose text was adopted without amendment by the editors of the Folio; the *Merry Wives*, 1602, which they rejected, has a bad text, undoubtedly pirated, but the Folio text is also unsatisfactory, and the Quarto helps to correct minor errors. Students will acknowledge with gratitude that the Shakespeare Association could hardly have chosen to make a more valuable contribution to this particular branch of scholarship.

H. SELLERS.

LONDON.

Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain. By JAMES A. S. MCPEEK. (*Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*, xv.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1939. x+411 pp. 21s.

This is a searching and comprehensive examination of the influence of Catullus upon English poetry during the sixteenth and seventeenth

centuries. The few allusions to Catullus and isolated quotations from his poems by English writers of the Middle Ages such as William of Malmesbury and John of Salisbury were unquestionably derived from the second-hand authority of imitators and grammarians, though it is none the less interesting to trace the survival of distinctive Catullan features in the Ariadne-Isolde story as handled by Thomas of Britain. Even during the sixteenth century the influence appears to have been, for the most part, indirect, as shown, for instance, in Skelton's *Phyllyp Sparowe*, which, according to Mr McPeck, bears evidence of indebtedness to imitations of the two Catullan sparrow poems (*Carmina* ii and iii) rather than to their originals. Too much importance should not be attached to Skelton's self-assumed title 'British Catullus', which is only on a par with his other bantering claims. 'That he called himself the British Catullus offers no proof in itself that he knew the *Carmina*, it appears more probable that he was referring to the fame that Catullus enjoyed as an uninhibited lyrical poet even among people who presumably knew nothing of his poems.' Mr McPeck's exhaustive analysis of motives in Elizabethan epithalamia shows that these, likewise, while originally deriving from Catullus, are in most cases attributable to common stock of more recent growth, Spenser being most heavily indebted to the *Epithalame* of Marc-Claude de Buttet. The direct influence of Catullus first becomes significant in Campion and Jonson, subsequently extending to the 'Sons of Ben' and their successors, including Randolph, Crashaw, Cartwright, Herrick, Lovelace and Marvell, though incidentally Mr McPeck considers that in Herrick's case the influence was comparatively slight. Generally speaking, imitation is preferred to direct translation, as shown, for instance, in the numerous echoes of 'Vivamus, mea Lesbia', betokening a common affinity with the Catullan spirit. But the translations present many points of interest and in the chapter devoted to them attention is called to several pieces of considerable merit though little known.

It is almost inevitable that a study of this kind, entailing continual parallelism, should make somewhat heavy reading. This difficulty might perhaps have been partially overcome had the writer adopted a different plan in assembling his material and allowed more space to form instead of concentrating almost exclusively upon material. With this qualification Mr McPeck's study can be recommended as an important contribution to English scholarship, fully annotated and documented.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

LONDON.

The Miltonic Setting: Past and Present. By E. M. W. TILLYARD. Cambridge: University Press. 1938. 208 pp. 7s. 6d.

There is no need at this date to commend a book by Mr Tillyard on Milton. This is a collection of essays (some of them reprints of articles already known to Milton students) to which a certain unity is given by two main themes: 'I have tried', says Mr Tillyard, 'to attach Milton more firmly to his age and to defend him against modern defamation.'

The first essay is a reprint of Mr Tillyard's English Association pamphlet on *L'Allegro and Il Penseroso*, which is valuable without being so revolutionary as Mr Tillyard seems to think. Mr Tillyard has established the connexion between the two poems and the *First Prolusion*; but he will hardly convince a reader of the poems that they are a 'poetical exercise' on the theme of the Prolusion (*Whether Day or Night is the more excellent*) or that the opening paragraphs are burlesque verse 'calculated to delight and impress an undergraduate audience' and can only 'be understood or justified' in relation to such an audience. He concludes that the poems are the fruit of a country holiday in the Long Vacation of 1631. But why should he suppose that this contradicts 'their mythical connection with Horton'? The country holiday might well have been spent at Horton, where Milton's father had possibly settled by 1631. And why should he suppose that Milton's departure from Cambridge constitutes a complete 'break' in his life? Milton continued at Horton much the same course of life as at Cambridge. Even if the poems were the fruit of a University vacation we may still read them in the traditional way, as a picture of his life at Horton presented under the two dominating moods which he calls Melancholy and Mirth.

In the middle part of his book Mr Tillyard is mainly engaged in defending Milton against recent disparagement. He treats these anti-Miltonist critics seriously and is thereby forced into elaborating the obvious. He has to argue at length that Keats reacted against Milton's influence as he would have reacted against a like dominating influence by any other writer; that Milton was not deficient in visual imagination, was master of any style he needed, and that his artistry is not 'mere artistry' but a creative act. In the chapter on *Milton and Primitive Feeling* he follows Miss Bodkin in finding that Milton is rich in 'archetypal patterns' of thought and 'owes much of his greatness to being close to primitive and elemental habits of mind'; this psycho-analytical criticism is harmless enough in a general discussion of a poet's genius, but when it leads Mr Tillyard to interpret *Lycidas* 'as a rendering of the "rebirth pattern"', one may perhaps be excused for preferring Milton's poem:

Ay me! whilst thee the shores and sounding seas
Wash far away....

The chapter on *Milton and Protestantism* leads up to an interesting analysis of the motive of *Samson Agonistes*, but Mr Tillyard's paradox that Milton was an orthodox Protestant demands a fuller and more closely reasoned argument than he offers.

In his last chapters Mr Tillyard deals with Milton's place in the English epic tradition and the relation of *Paradise Lost* to contemporary theory and practice:

The Renaissance epic was predominantly cultural and political, as against the medieval epic, which was religious and concerned itself with personal salvation. Milton's *Arthuriad*, had it been written, would have been of this Renaissance kind.... When he comes to write his great poem politics have become less important than the fate of the individual soul. The result is that he turns against the whole heroic tradition

of the Renaissance....The glory of *Paradise Lost* is that it resumes the essential medieval theme and combines it with Renaissance culture and exuberance and with neo-classic compression of form.

B. A. WRIGHT.

SOUTHAMPTON.

John Dryden, a Bibliography of Early Editions and Drydeniana. By HUGH MACDONALD. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1939. xiv + 358 pp. 30s.

The idea of a Dryden Bibliography was suggested to Mr Hugh Macdonald by Mr P. J. Dobell, who placed in his hands a notebook in which the late Mr G. Thorn Drury had made memoranda in the course of his reading. Beginning under these distinguished auspices his vast and laborious research, involving an examination not only of all Dryden's publications, but of many other works belonging to the same period, has produced a book that is decidedly one of the best bibliographies of an English author that has ever been published. A complete Dryden bibliography would, of course, far exceed the limits even of Mr Macdonald's amply proportioned volume. His book is a record of all the works published in Dryden's lifetime together with the numbers of Tonson's *Miscellany* published after his death and all the collected editions published up to Derrick's second edition of 1767. Nearly one-fifth of the volume is devoted to a section of Drydeniana dealing with seventy-six works published between 1668 and 1747, containing important allusions to Dryden. In fact, Mr Macdonald rightly describes his work as 'an allusion book as well as a bibliography'.

The actual work of bibliographical recording, as far as the present reviewer has been able to test it, appears to have been done with the most meticulous care and to attain a very high degree of accuracy. The system of collation recommended by Dr W. W. Greg in his *Formulary for Collation* is closely adhered to, except for one minor variation mentioned in the Preface. A particularly attractive feature of the volume is to be found in the numerous and extremely valuable notes containing many quotations from Dryden's letters, the diaries of Pepys, Evelyn and Luttrell, Ailesbury's *Memoirs* and other less known contemporary works. Good examples are the footnote on p. 47 dealing with *A Song for St Cecilia's Day*, and that on p. 115 concerning Dryden's personal relations with Milton, the description of the performances of Dryden's plays at Oxford (pp. 137, 138) and the very important notes on *An Essay upon Satyr* (p. 217). A special and most useful section is devoted to the allusions to Dryden in *Poems on Affairs of State*. There is a very full and well-arranged index. The proof reading, always a difficult task in a work of this sort, has been remarkably careful, and I have only detected two misprints ('Calvanistic', p. 225, n. 3, and '*Bellemira*', Index, p. 353).

This book provides an indispensable foundation for all future biographical, editorial and critical work on Dryden. Mr Macdonald is to be

congratulated on the successful completion of a great enterprise and the Oxford University Press on this fine addition to its famous bibliographical series.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

NOTTINGHAM.

Strolling Players and Drama in the Provinces, 1660-1765. By SYBIL ROSENFELD. Cambridge: University Press. 1939. x+334 pp. 15s.

The author of this book has two admirable purposes: to bring together a great deal of miscellaneous information concerning provincial acting, and to convey something of her own nostalgic enthusiasm for eighteenth-century grease-paint. In both aims she succeeds, but the first is much more consistently pursued than the second. There is an excellent chapter on 'The Strolling Life', but it extends only to twenty-four pages, and we feel that the curtain has dropped on an exciting scene before the players have become as intimate with us as we would wish.

Miss Rosenfeld is exploring new territory, and it was clearly impossible to cover the whole field indicated by the title. So she has considered the theatrical life centred in, and radiating from, four towns: Norwich, York, Bath and Canterbury. There are additional chapters on Penkethman's Greenwich Theatre and the Richmond Hill Theatres, 1715-68. Often Miss Rosenfeld's story becomes a mere list of productions and their casts, but that could hardly be avoided. Some things, however, do stand out as remarkable after a consideration of these lists: the popularity of Shakespeare is evident, and so are the almost complete absence of other Elizabethan drama and the paucity and poverty of plays especially written for provincial production. Miss Rosenfeld's Index of Plays contains less than twenty Elizabethan (non-Shakespearean) titles, and several of these refer to later adaptations.

Information concerning provincial acting from 1660 to 1700 is very scarce, and this book does not throw much light on those years, apart from some useful information concerning the Norwich stage. However, Miss Rosenfeld quotes one passage which tells us something of conditions just after 1700. This is 'An Epilogue, made by a Gentleman of Hereford, occasion'd by meeting a Company of Strolers on the Road', which gives an amusing, pathetic picture of a company of strollers, who make a curious contrast to the noble characters they represent on the stage. The characters mentioned are Dryden's Maiden Queen, his Montezuma, Southerne's Oroonoko and Imoinda, and Lee's 'Young Ammon' (i.e. Alexander), and the strollers are called the 'Jovial Crew'. Miss Rosenfeld found this in *A Choice Collection of Poetry*, published in 1738 by Joseph Yarrow, the York comedian. But it appeared as early as 1705 in *The Diverting Post* for March 3-10 of that year, where it was titled 'On a Company of Strolers that were lately at Hereford. By H. H.' There are slight differences between the two versions, but the same characters are referred to in both. It appears, then, that Restoration plays soon found their way to the country.

This book will be of considerable value to students of eighteenth-century drama, and the well-chosen illustrations bring the subject admirably to life. It is unfortunate that no full bibliography is given.

CLIFFORD LEECH.

DURHAM.

The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Later Years (1821–1850). Arranged and Edited by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1939. Vol. I, 1821–1830, pp. xxxviii + 544; Vol. II, 1831–1840, pp. xiv + 545–1060; Vol. III, 1841–1850, pp. xii + 1061–1408. 63s.

Within a little more than a decade, students of Wordsworth have been supplied with an unprecedented body of first-hand materials meticulously copied from the original manuscripts and competently edited by scholars who by long training and service have made this field their own. From 1927 to 1938 Professor E. J. Morley has published six substantial volumes based on the Crabb Robinson papers presenting much new information on the Wordsworth circle; and Professor Leshe N. Broughton issued 140 letters of the series exchanged between Wordsworth and his American editor, Professor Reed, 1836–1850, all but a few appearing in print for the first time. These seven volumes are of very great importance; but all would agree that primacy must be given to the six large volumes of Wordsworth correspondence edited by Professor de Selincourt and published from 1935 to 1939, as they contain still more new and important testimony concerning the poet and make it incumbent on everyone who plans to write anything on him to recognize that we are all put to ignorance again and must begin anew.

A few figures will show that this new material is given in no scanty measure. The six volumes of de Selincourt give about 1700 letters, of which about 850, or one-half, are here published for the first time, and approximately 300 are now first published complete and according to the manuscripts, many of them being first made intelligible. Taking Knight as a measure, the wholly new letters come rather close to Knight's total of about 900, of which many are fragmentary; if we include the 300 partially new letters, the amount of hitherto unpublished matter far surpasses the total of Knight's three volumes. All the new matter is not important, of course, but the unimportant is not proportionally greater than in Knight.

This proportion of entirely new matter is maintained in the three concluding volumes now under review, for out of a total of 1051 letters 574 have never before been published and 135 now appear according to the true and original copies. These impressive figures are not to be diminished in importance by regarding the new matter as insignificant, for so far is this from the truth that the new letters are among the most revealing in the whole collection, supplying us with new evidence, much of it important and some of it startlingly new. We have space for only a few instances.

We have abundant confirmation of Miss Batho's recent findings that the eye trouble from which the poet suffered was more serious, more continuous, and more long-standing than has been supposed. In 1834 he wrote to Montagu that he had suffered from repeated inflammations of the eyes during the last thirty years, and they had become so weak as to make reading and writing, unless for a very little time, injurious to them. Thus he was forced to settle down in a world of the semi-blind, restricted in his reading by the necessity of having others read to him. In addition to semi-blindness he had to bear the humiliation of bodily pain in stomach or great toe. Hence came the exasperations and bursts of bad temper, not by any means always suppressed, but frequently displayed—and for which he once handsomely apologized to his wife in 1837, after the vexations of a very complete revision of the poems for the six-volume edition of 1836–37. It is hardly to be wondered at that such handicaps, so closely connected with the oral or written composition of poetry and continued for over forty years, should have decisively interfered with creative activity.

We have also painful confirmation by Wordsworth himself, in a letter to Southey in 1835, that Dorothy was for years, and perhaps for all her life, a victim of the opium habit. We now know that her strange and violent behaviour was the result of attempts to reduce the drug rather than that of a psychopath suffering from the consequences of suppressed desires; and we can sympathize more fully with the poet in the agonized guard over the dear, sole sister in her living death up to the very end of his own days.

A letter of October 1795, belatedly published on pp. 1333–4, establishes on the poet's own authority the beginning of one of the most famous and significant of all literary friendships, for in the September of that year he first met Coleridge. 'I saw but little of him. I wished indeed to have seen more—his talent appears to me very great.' This, his earliest judgment, was to be more than confirmed by long and intimate acquaintance, and in it he never wavered even in those years when 'whispering tongues' poisoned the truth of brotherly love.

Still another matter is made clearer by the editor's explanation of a passage in letter No. 817 and the correction of Knight's dating of Nos. 1296 and 1303 from 1828 to 1839. The poet is cleared of the charge that he unreasonably delayed the marriage of Dora to Edward Quillinan for several years. But a new letter, No. 1253, belonging to 1838, shows the father's opposition to the marriage in a most ungracious light, and in No. 1303, belonging to the time when the poet is supposed to have yielded, he speaks of Dora's 'long-tried preference and choice'. As this is a reference to Quillinan, there is a distinct implication of a struggle between father and daughter of more than a year or two, the final result of which was not so much a treaty of peace as an armed neutrality. It was a case of steel against steel, and Dora was the victor, as we might have expected from some frank letters now first published, in which aunt Dorothy characterizes the wilful, undisciplined darling of Dove Cottage. Is it possible that there were other suitors more pleasing in the

father's eyes? One would like to know more of Mr Crackenthorpe who appears in 1826, of Mr Ayling, 1831, and of that shadowy third suitor, name unknown

A careful study of the new material in these volumes ought to dispel the long-accepted tradition that by 1820 Wordsworth had settled down into innocuous placidity and sterility. The list of his productions during thirty years is sufficient evidence of the untruth of any such tradition, and the record in these letters proves his diligence in the pursuit of his art. He was almost constantly engaged in the revisions which he thought necessary for the complete editions of 1827, in which *The Excursion* appears in the final text, save for a few later changes; of 1836-37; of 1841-42, of 1845, and of 1849-50. To these revisions we must add the re-writings of *The Prelude*. When we remember that the texts of many of the earlier poems as we read them to-day are the result of these supposedly sterile years, and when we realize that revision meant an entirely new imagining of the poem, we cannot think lightly of Wordsworth's poetic activity, and we can accept fully what he himself said of the edition of 1836-37:

But after all, the value of this edition in the eyes of the judicious, as hereafter will be universally admitted, lies in the pains which has been taken in the revisal of so many of the old poems, to the re-modelling, and often re-writing whole Paragraphs which you know have cost me great labour and I do not repent of it. In the Poems lately written I have had comparatively little trouble.

Three proposed works indicate his continued interest in the problems of poetry and aesthetics: in 1825 he thought of making Snowdon the scene of a Dialogue upon Nature, Poetry, and Painting—to be illustrated by the surrounding scenery; and in 1829 he speaks of a proposed life of Thomson, with representative poems. Another proposal, also belonging to 1825, was an exposition of Longinus, to show that he does not treat of the sublime, but of 'animated, impassioned, energetic, elevated writing'.

He has been represented as the uncompromising Tory and apostate, opposed to reform of the ballot and to Catholic relief. While this is substantially true and beyond argument, we can understand him if we remember his experiences in revolutionary France. In 1835 he tells us that the scenes which he witnessed during the early years of the French Revolution 'come back to him with appalling violence'. He never could get free from these terrible recollections, which made it impossible for him to discriminate between the past and the present. This may argue a lack of intelligence and prejudice on the part of the poet; but we must remember that Wordsworth was an artist who depended on recollection as the source of his poetry, and so it is not surprising to learn that the inner experiences which directed him to the heights of poetry also served him as a guide in practical life. He was unable to write verses that do not spring up from an inward and overpowering impulse, and we know that his daily life was conducted on similar irrational principles. He was the explorer, never at rest, in society and yet not of it; upholder of the Church, but abhorrer of Priests and Priestcraft. His life was marked by

contradictions: he despised politicians but campaigned with them, a poet who uttered nothing base, but a defender of the morality of Chaucer's most bawdy tales; a Churchman apparently living in the odour of sanctity but wishing himself more at ease in his own inner nature and finding that with the years his spirituality became not more but less.

The new letters present us a fresh picture of Isabella Fenwick, and it is most comforting to find that the notes dictated to her in 1843 are almost certainly a faithful record of the poet's mind. Some of the letters to her are the best that the poet ever wrote, and from them we have fresh views of his mind. For instance, writing of a certain pair who seemed very ill-suited to each other and to one who knew of Annette Vallon, he says: 'Well, Love sees everything through his own eyes and you know that love grows out of opportunity, in my mind indeed more than out of anything else.' Does this saying help to place the Annette episode in its true setting?

ARTHUR BEATY.

MADISON, WISCONSIN.

The Poetical Works of John Keats. Edited by H. W. GARROD. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1939. lxxxix+572 pp. 30s.

This book must hold a distinct and assured place amongst the editions of Keats's poetry; it is unlikely that anyone will attempt again the special task that Mr Garrod has performed. To begin with, he furnishes a complete critical apparatus for the text; drawing on all the now available sources in autograph, in transcript, and in print. There are, further, dissertations, often elaborate, upon each of these sources, and others on the composition and dating of the *Poems* of 1817 and of *Endymion*. There is much bibliographical detail.

Professor Garrod does not come into competition with Professor De Selincourt; his purpose is different, and he does not study 'sources' or offer (save now and then while discussing the text) an aesthetic commentary. He pays the fullest honours to the labours of his chief precursor, the late Mr Harry Buxton Forman; and, having himself recollected the same originals—save those that have vanished—marvels at his accuracy. Buxton Forman's cheap Oxford edition of the *Poems* (latest reprint, 1937), with its numerous textual notes, is of the utmost value to the ordinary studious reader; and behind this there are, at need, his larger and fuller editions. Garrod, however, has had 'the advantage of using a good many MSS' not previously known or not fully studied. He does not formally enumerate them; they include, for instance, many poems or parts of poems in the libraries of Harvard, Pierpont Morgan, Huntington, and of Texas University.

For the volumes denoted by *1817*, *Endymion*, and *1820* there is already something very like a *textus receptus*, and the interest of the variants lies in the light they often throw upon the poet's 'first fingerings and gropings'. Here there is indeed a wealth of material; for we have, for all but one of the longer poems, his numerous autograph drafts, at one stage or another

of the process. The exception is the *Fall of Hyperion*, of which more presently. For the mass of the other posthumous work the problems are often different; though here too we have much from Keats's own hand. The value of different transcripts has to be appraised, and the text adjusted accordingly. It is often a most complex business, as for instance, in *Otho the Great*; here numerous separate fragments of autograph, and one almost complete transcript, are in question. But throughout the book all the variants are given at the foot of the page, and the reader can judge for himself of the text adopted. The arrangement is also novel. It is not a purely chronological one, based on an approximate dating of composition; this method has many drawbacks. Garrod seeks to 'present the poet... as he was gradually unfolded to the knowledge of the times' (p. xxv). He begins with the three volumes printed in Keats's lifetime, then proceeds with the verse in the *Literary Remains* of 1848 and in the *Memoir* of 1848, both produced by Monckton Milnes (a great sinner in textual matters). Then comes the *Fall*, and then the '41 posthumous pieces not used by, or not known to, Milnes'; and finally the verse which Garrod baptizes *Trivia* and which include one or two pieces not printed in any previous edition. This arrangement works well and is to be welcomed. I think that Garrod is also right in keeping most of those incongruities of Keats's spelling, which Buxton Forman tried to make consistent.

No adequate *compte rendu* of so much labour and learning can be given here. Instead, as a comparatively simple illustration of Garrod's method, let me note some points in the *Fall of Hyperion*. Here, since there are only scraps of autograph recorded, there is no question of watching 'fingerings and gropings'; we have to find our way back to the text on which Keats finally decided. There are transcripts: one is by Woodhouse (denoted *W*²), to whose remarkable 'integrity' as a copyist Garrod testifies; and this is adopted, *verbatim et literatim*, as the basis of the text. Another (*R*), of lines 1-326, is in the Reynolds Commonplace Book in the Bristol Central Library, and is thought to be 'an independent copy of the same original' as was used by Woodhouse. The whole poem was first printed, with many errors or guesses, by Milnes in 1856; some of his readings, which many editors have followed, are pinned out in the foot-notes. Here every word matters, since those parts of the *Fall* which are absent in *Hyperion* contain some of Keats's perfect, and of his most exalted, poetry. Long ago Robert Bridges wrote that the poem is 'the most mature attempt that he ever made to express some of his own convictions concerning human life'. Mr M. R. Ridley, in *Keats' Craftsmanship* (pp. 267 ff.), pleads with force that some of the passages which do coincide with *Hyperion*, so far from being 'a rather feeble recast of an earlier work', are consummate in their own way and in some respects an improvement. Now and then, but not usually, Buxton Forman has kept a reading (of Milnes) that Garrod corrects. 'Imagination from the sable chain' (i. 10) should be *charm*. So, too, 'An aching palsy' (i. 426) should be 'a shaking Palsy'. In i. 97 the text here adopted invites a question; the passage is one of the poet's rarest. Milnes printed, 'As in midday the sickening east wind'. 'As' should be 'when'; but the problem arises over

'midday'. Garrod's three sources read 'midway',¹ but his text has 'mid-May', a version which he ascribes in the note to A. E. Housman. I fear I do not know whether or when Housman printed this—no reference is given; but surely, whether the change be for better or worse, it is but a case of one good poet overwriting another, without visible authority?

Some stray notes may be added. (1) The text prints the admittedly better version ('knight-at-arms') of *La Belle Dame sans Merci* and banishes to footnotes the readings of the inferior one ('wretched wight'), printed in 1820 in the *Indicator*. It seems, however, to be proved (pp. xlix-l) that this last was really Keats's *later* draft; and Garrod, I believe justly, remarks that it is not 'in the Ten Commandments of criticism that we should always print a poet's second version'. Perhaps, though, in view of its origin, it might have been given *in extenso* beside the first version, although to do so might not 'placate the ghost' of Sidney Colvin.

(2) See pp. li-lii for the argument about the disputed line of 'In a drear-nighted December'. The authority of the MS. is for 'The feel of not to feel it', the first printed versions have 'To know the change and feel it'—which most of us thankfully accept. Garrod pleads that this improved version can only be due to Keats himself, largely on the ground that if he did not write it, 'who did'? A reviewer in *The Times Literary Supplement* (24 June 1939) strongly demurs, and points, correctly, to the poet's curious fondness for 'feel' as a noun, denoting a bodily sensation, and adds that it 'belongs to the province of "sensation" in which he [Keats] was a master'. There seems to be a deadlock here, for the decisive evidence is wanting; but the reading 'the feel', whether or no it be more subtle and 'logical', is much worse poetry.

(3) It was right, in my belief, to include all the *Trivia*, with the usual solemn apparatus. What if some of them betray the touch of commonness which Keats, as we know, tried so hard to leave behind him? Some of them, probably made for home consumption, are very spirited and amusing. The sonnet, printed already in *The Times Literary Supplement* but never yet in any edition ('Where didst thou find, young Bard . . .?'), has a sestet that opens in the truly grand style: 'Who from a pot of stout e'er blew the froth Into the bosom of the wandering wind . . .?' There is nothing so good as this in the few other bits of verse that are new discoveries.

O. ELTON.

OXFORD.

¹ See the interesting note in De Selincourt's edition, p. 563. and A. C. Bradley's justification of 'midday' as a picture of what actually happens as the wind shifts round from E. to S.W.

Studies in Keats, new and old. By MIDDLETON MURRY. Second Edition. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1939. 145 + 27 pp. 8s. 6d.

Keats, the development of his mind. By BHAWANI SANKAR CHOWDHURI. University of Calcutta. 1938. ix + 127 pp.

In the second edition of his studies in Keats, Mr Middleton Murry has included three new essays, *The Poet and the Dreamer*, *Keats and Milton* and *Keats and Wordsworth*. The first two are controversial, defending positions attacked by other critics. The defence is subtle, and enables Mr Murry to introduce certain large speculations such as the thesis that men differ qualitatively as well as quantitatively in their response to life. He makes his debating points well, and, in addition, has many a fine perception to record, but the argument tends often to become thin-spun, mystical and exasperating. The essay on Keats and Wordsworth is more interesting. The influence of Wordsworth was profound, and Mr Murry suggests and illustrates its nature and extent. But much is more interesting as a revelation of the author's mind and interests than as a clarification of the achievement of Keats. In reaching out to those general truths by which he himself seeks to live, Mr Murry awakens the suspicion that the poet's meaning is a starting-point rather than an end.

Mr Chowdhuri begins well. He presents *Endymion* as a Chaucerian tale, into which other tales are fitted, and decries attempts to treat it as an allegory. This is a good road to follow, neglected overmuch of late, but we leave it too soon for a detailed analysis of a personal allegory in *Lamia*. Lycius is the heart of Keats and Appolonius his higher wisdom, which in his love affair with Fanny Brawne has learnt that sexual love is a snare and a delusion to men. The intellectual delight of finding the allegorical clues in Keats's narratives is a greater snare. Mr Chowdhuri has some pertinent criticism of previous critics, and attempts to clear up the problem of the meaning of the term 'sensation'. From time to time a poet sees another poet imaginatively, but the intellectual seduction proves too strong. The life of Keats must be made to show continuous growth towards a complete reading of the riddle of life, and he must be made consistent with himself at all costs. How regretfully one leaves the open road of the early approach for the burrowings of the later over-intellectual analysis! We know too much at present about the private life of Keats, and his happy anticipations of thoughts, and cannot read his poems as simple poems and nought else.

W. D. THOMAS.

SWANSEA.

L'Actualité de Carlyle. By ERNEST SEILLIÈRE. (*Collection Les Essais Critiques*, no. 51.) Paris: La Nouvelle Revue Critique. 252 pp. 18 fr.

Carlyle once more! An ideological battle corresponding in some measure to the war of the nations now unhappily proceeding rages over his work. Nobody acquainted with the philosophical polemics of M.

Ernest Seillière will look in the present book for anything like the detachment of, say, M. Cazamian, whose excellent book on Carlyle dates from 1913. But nobody could now treat the work of the Sage with detachment, since he has been pushed into the front line of the struggle. Last year I reviewed in these pages a remarkably thorough account¹ of modern reactions in the Latin countries to the Carlylean thesis which demonstrated how hopeless it is to look for anything like detachment.

And does it appear that a detached critic could come to any other major conclusions than M. Seillière comes to in this propagandist work? The quarrel is so naked, the ideas for good or ill so sharply distinguished, that there is hardly any room for doubt as to the tendency of Carlyle's contribution to modern conceptions of government. In his own day a free spirit like Emerson could nod approval of his theories, but since his time we have had the benefit of actuality to sharpen our wits.

M. Seillière's thesis in brief is that Carlyle was the first and certainly the noisiest publicist to throw reason to the dogs—eighteenth-century reason with its confidence in progress—and embrace a species of romantic mysticism which only required to be extended to include race worship to realize fully the doctrines which have poisoned the air since Nazi Germany assumed control of the Reich. M. Seillière would indeed add race fanaticism to Carlyle's heresies, but it should be remembered that in the 'sixties of last century there was a good deal of vague Nordic enthusiasm floating about. Even Adam Bede was Nordic man—see George Eliot's lyrical description of the carpenter.

But of course it is in his doctrine of the Great Man or Hero that Carlyle exposes himself most to modern obloquy. Perhaps he was misunderstood as Machiavelli was; perhaps the Christian tradition of his upbringing which mingles with his most extravagant thought to some extent sanitizes his conception—as our author freely allows—but see the conception under M. Seillière's lens and thank Heaven for the clarity of the French language and the vigour of French thinking. In reaction from eighteenth-century rationalism and its Utilitarian legates, Carlyle declared that the logician without inspiration, genius, was a cause of decrepitude and ruin. Wordsworth had said something like this, but Carlyle under German tutelage went on to discover that, far from being aware of himself and his own mental processes, the Great Man is characterized by his Inconscience. As our author puts it: 'L'homme grand, l'homme parfait est un mystère à ses propres yeux. Tout ce qui se connaît soi-même (c'était pourtant là le sage précepte de la Grèce dorienne) est déjà petit, plus ou moins imparfait.' To this sort of mystic vitalism, the meddling intellect is anathema. The Great Man is merely an expression of a vital urge in a people, both creatures of the Immanent Will. State frontiers, human freedom, morality itself must yield to the urge of the Inconscient. We have had all this before, but are glad to have it presented so clearly by one whose life's work it has been to track down German mysticism with its monstrous postulates and destructive effects.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

¹ *Carlyle et la Pensée Latine* by Professor A. C. Taylor.

Melville in the South Seas. By CHARLES ROBERTS ANDERSON. New York: Columbia University Press, London: H. Milford. 1939. 522 pp. 22s. 6d.

The novels of Herman Melville were known from the time of their publication to be a mixture of fact and fiction, but the amount of each was always in dispute. The revival of interest in him since his centenary in 1919 has been accompanied by a flood of biographical and critical works, but until this volume by Professor Anderson was published little attempt that was critical had been made to sort fact from fiction in his popular romances of adventure in the South Seas. *Melville in the South Seas* is a scrutiny of these romances in the light of information hitherto undiscovered, both official—from the records of the United States Navy—and of more miscellaneous nature. The author's first task was to make an authentic record of Melville's life in the four formative years, 1841–45, examining carefully the details and the possible sources of incidents in the stories. Much combing has probably accumulated all that were used, and by their aid the genuinely autobiographical is sifted from the imaginary, and the story of these years of wandering is set forth in as exact detail as seems possible.

Moby Dick, *Typee*, *Omoo* and *The White Jacket* are analysed incident by incident, and comparisons are made with the books Melville is known to have used as authorities, and with naval and other authentic records of his voyages. This makes it possible to isolate the literary elaboration of the novelist, and to arrive at certain conclusions about his methods of composition. In all, the core is personal experience, but he borrowed extensively, and without acknowledgment, anything that lay handy. This acquired material he always improved, giving to it an added intensity or dramatic power. His purpose was always to fashion a vivid and satisfying narrative, and to this interest autobiographical considerations had to submit. Many parallel passages display the methods and touches by which the transmutation was made.

Other lines of study are followed, which run naturally from the main one—Melville's art and technique, the propagandist bias of his mind, with its Rousseauist attack on civilization and its missionaries, etc. Attention is turned to the right things, to what Melville could do supremely well, and away from the marsh-light of philosophizing and allegory. By its excellent choice of material for quotation the book takes on somewhat of the nature of a travel book in itself, and is a distinct contribution to knowledge.

W. D. THOMAS.

SWANSEA.

The Dynasts and the Post-War Age in Poetry. By AMIYA CHAKRAVARTY. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1938. 174 pp. 7s. 6d.

Though *The Dynasts* is chosen by the author only as a 'promontory from whence to view the turbulent stretches of modern verse' it cannot be said that he has not done full justice to that melancholy drama both as

philosophy and poetry. As for the philosophy Mr Chakravarty provides what I consider the best interpretation so far attempted, and I think he is probably right in claiming that, though Hardy himself declined to reduce his poetical intuitions to a system, *The Dynasts* in many ways anticipates the trend of modern thought. In some measure Hardy is the archetype of the modern poet with his preoccupation with life in its full biological sense. Whether *The Dynasts* is a supreme example of the new metaphysical-biological method is a different matter. Many of us, who were not flippant with Max Beerbohm on its first appearance, begin to see the seams gape in the great myrioramic poem. For all that Mr Chakravarty is undoubtedly justified in pointing to its influence on the most welcome revival of poetic drama to-day. The most interesting chapter in the book is probably that on 'Hardy and the Modern Poetic Drama'.

In this chapter Mr Chakravarty implies rather than says that Mr T. S. Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral* owes something both technically and psychologically to *The Dynasts*. They have the same central theme, the sufferings of self-consciousness in a world which has failed to control Nature. But Eliot's aloofness and spiritual contempt for the masses and for 'progress' without religious sanction are contrasted with Hardy's humanity. Mr Chakravarty is, I fear, one of the critics who cannot mention Mr Eliot's name without coughing. More direct continuity with the art of *The Dynasts* is seen in the dramatic work of Mr W. H. Auden, Mr Day-Lewis, and Mr Stephen Spender. The choruses, the attempt to show life from different planes, the constant shifting of time and space perspective, all speak of the technical devices of the earlier drama.

The book displays some minor crudities which are more than made up for by the brilliant treatment of the central theme. It seems to have undergone a revision by which a mass of matter in the text has been relegated to the notes, where the occasional crudities referred to occur. It is a definite contribution to our understanding of modern poetry.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

Der Deutsche in der englischen Literatur vom Beginn der Romantik bis zum Ausbruch des Weltkrieges. By FRITZ SCHULTZ. (*Studien zur englischen Philologie*, xciv.) Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1939. 188 pp. 7M 20.

The subject of this book is of intense interest to both Germans and Englishmen at the present time and a thorough, well-founded work, written from an impartial point of view, would have been of great value. It is regrettable that Dr Schultz has not fulfilled his task, all the more since the series in which his dissertation appears entitles the reviewer to measure it by standards to which it cannot attain.

The book is concerned with the English view of the German character as reflected in literature from the Romantics to the beginning of the last war. The writer's standards are primitive in the extreme. Favourable comments on the German character and German institutions are taken as objective estimates, while unfavourable utterances are disregarded or

stigmatized as 'unsachlich', 'beschränkt', 'parteiisch', etc. The English conception of the German character is shown to develop from the alternatives of Grobianus and Faust towards a wide range of differentiated types. The English mistrust of Germany as a commercial and political rival after the Franco-Prussian War is rightly emphasized, and its culmination in the years before 1914 is well brought out. Kipling is the black sheep as usual, Dr Schultz having selected from Kipling's small gallery of German characters one only to exemplify his assertions, forgetting Hans Breitmann and the Forestry Officer Muller. This is typical of his approach. In the same way Coleridge's strictures on Cologne are ignored, since they would spoil the picture of the poet as the only Englishman who has given a really correct (i.e. favourable) estimate of the German character.

The disposition is unconvincing and ill-arranged, so that the same poet appears in many different places—three different genres and two different periods in the case of Matthew Arnold—with nothing fresh to say. Dr Schultz has shown great industry in collecting together such literature of the subject as favours his thesis. While doing so he has, however, omitted many important sources which would have enlightened him in many directions. The style is strongly reminiscent of a certain kind of German journalese, and phrases such as 'die Gemeinsamkeit der Verbundenheit' (p. 122); 'jeden Tag läßt er eine der beiden Weisen des berühmten Komponisten [Mozart!] erklingen' (p. 63); 'jedoch die Zähne der Bäuerinnen und Dienstmädchen sind von blendender Weiße, wobei ihm [Coleridge] die Angewohnheit auffällt, mit Pantoffeln auf die Straße zu gehen' (p. 40); and 'geistige Ströme, die über den Kanal fließen' (p. 36) should not appear in print in a work of this kind. The book as a whole is slipshod in style, treatment and criticism.

In justice to that distinguished scholar, the founder of the *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, it may be noted that this work is not a product of his Seminar.

LEONARD FORSTER.

CAMBRIDGE.

The Personal Heresy. A Controversy. By E. M. W. TILLYARD and C. S. LEWIS. London: Oxford University Press. 1939. viii + 150 pp. 6s.

This book reprints three papers originally published in *Essays and Studies*, and prints for the first time three further papers in which the controversy is rounded off with Mr Lewis's discussion of what is poetry. The original question of debate was how far the personality of the poet is expressed in the written words. It would be impertinent to contribute to the controversy without doing so at length, but one may note that Mr Lewis, who originated the controversy on the negative side, is unfortunate in having chosen the wrong horse—unfortunate because he rides with such skill and pleasure: his debating style is impeccable. Mr Tillyard, who has the better case, does not argue so interestingly. He is right when he remarks that Mr Lewis 'presses the distinction between

art and life too far' (p. 78). Mr Tillyard sees poems as more intimately related to their makers. But even he does not allow the potential relevance, for reader and critic, of 'literary gossip' about the 'quotidian personality' of the poet. He agrees with Mr Lewis that if it were known that Keats first read of senators (which, to put it bluntly, he used as a metaphor for trees in *Hyperion*) 'in a little brown book, in a room smelling of boiled beef, the same day that he pulled out a loose tooth', that scrap of biography would have no value for the reader of *Hyperion*. But surely such an instance, simply because it is invented, has no place in the argument. If such a fact had survived, it would presumably have survived through the agency of Keats. If so, it would tell us something about Keats's mind and senses, the way he experienced his life and, when all is said and done, it is out of that mind that the poems spring, or crawl. If Keats had come to the point of recording this fact, he might not have been the poet to see trees as senators at all. What is preserved is preserved because someone, perhaps the poet, perhaps a friend, thinks it worth preserving. If the poet preserves it, the thing preserved has obvious importance; if the friend, its importance depends on the quality of the friend as a witness (Aubrey's gossip tells us often more about Aubrey than about its subject). But because the value of the fact is difficult to assess, this does not mean that the reader and critic are free to despise it. If they lack the key to its significance for the poet, and so for his poem, they may have their own imperfect perception to blame, or, alternately, the fact itself, which may be too fragmentary to suggest a context or a whole. The reader and critic can afford to neglect nothing (not even bibliography!). When they learn, for instance, that for Keats as a boy fighting was 'meat and drink', they are ready to notice, perhaps for the first time, some quality in the bone and flesh of the poems themselves. A poem addresses itself to the best readers at their best. Literary 'gossip' can play a part in helping readers to achieve their best.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker. By WALTHER VON WARTBURG.
Halle: Niemeyer. 1939. vii+180 pp. 23 maps and 1 plate. 8 M.

From Professor von Wartburg we expect constructive thinking and clear exposition, and our expectations are not disappointed in *Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker*. It will take its place on the shelves of discriminating readers (and not only, nor mainly, philologists) beside P. Savi-Lopez's *Origini neolatini*, but it will not displace that little classic. Professor von Wartburg's approach is quite different; he draws conclusions from different facts, and he is more concerned to present a complete picture of the life of Romance peoples. He determines as exactly as possible the nature of the romanization and the germanization of the area, the classes who brought the Latin language to different sections and the density of the invaders; but he adds to these facts a vast number of details as to administration and economics so as to give

a fairly complete picture of life in the Romance area from the second to the tenth centuries. Specifically linguistic details are sparingly given, but wide consequences are drawn from them. It is with surprise that one encounters a whole page of bristling derivations from Lombardic (p. 145) after so many pages set in plain roman type.

The author enters into his subject in the second chapter: 'Die Völker um das westliche Mittelmeer vor dem Eingreifen Roms.' The chief novelty in this chapter is the insistence on 'Alpine' words and coincidences between Basque and the Sardinian dialects. As a name for the pre-Roman people of the Mediterranean coast he accepts 'Ligurian'. He agrees with Schuchardt in regarding the Iberi as akin to the Berbers, and argues that they invaded not only Spain but Sardinia also. Then follows 'Roms Aufstieg und die Romanisierung des Reiches', beginning with the invasion of Italy by Latin and Italic. In the fourth chapter ('Zerfall der römischen Macht') the author deals with the beginnings of differentiation, and distinguishes (a) differences due to racial or social substrata from (b) those due to divergent evolution within the language. The retention of final -S in the West and its loss in Italy and Rumania is cited as an example of social divergence, since the latter was the vulgar practice. The colonization of Rumania by legionaries supports this view, but it may be disputed in Italy, where there has so often appeared a regard for the *volgare illustre*. In fact, when one opposes It. *muro muri* to Sp. *muro muros*, one may as easily argue that the retention of the nominative plural was due to better schooling. The racial substrata are held responsible for the developments -CT- > *χt*, U > u, -MB- -MP- -ND- -NT- > *mm mb nn nd* and F > h (sketch-map 5). For the first the Spanish peninsula is boldly included, but there are some difficulties unacknowledged. We know nothing of the actual use of Celtic in Spain at any date A.D. The shading crosses Celtic and non-Celtic areas indifferently, and there is some reason to believe in the persistence of -CT- in Andalusia until a late date. The similar correspondence of Lat. RECTE, Umbrian *rehte* is not acknowledged on the map, nor the Albano-Rumanian series *ht ft pt*. These, and Greek *ὀκτώ* > *ὀχτώ*, are facts to discourage the Celtic attribution. The Oscan series of equivalents (for MB etc.) should have been indicated in Catalonia and Aragon as facts, though not necessarily as supports for the Oscan theory, since they could be explained differently. The aspiration of F is shown as limited to the country immediately adjacent to the Basque Provinces in Spain and France, but the evidence for other aspirations of F is, doubtless for simplicity's sake, not given.

An interesting suggestion is that the internal disruption of Latin should be dated by the criterium of the sonorization of -P- -T- -K- coincidentally with the outbreak of the third-century civil wars. The evidence is drawn, as it happens, from Spanish inscriptions. Exactly how much these inscriptions prove has been called in question, and it should at any rate be noted that the sonorization was still incomplete ten centuries later in the east and south of the Peninsula. H. F. Muller's *Chronology of Vulgar Latin* is not mentioned in the bibliography, nor are his views considered. This is a pity, for they at least serve as a question-mark.

'Die entscheidende Auseinandersetzung zwischen Reich und Germanen' is a well-nourished chapter, which owes much to Professor Gamillscheg and his pupils. The writer argues for a dense settlement of Germans only in the case of the Franks, and he uses toponymical evidence with great effect. He is, perhaps, inclined to overrate the influence of the Germans on other things than vocabulary. In comparison with this chapter the two following ('Die Balkanromanen' and 'Der Einbruch der Araber') are slender, and somewhat disappointing. The last chapter contains an account of the state of affairs about A.D. 1000, and a brief statement of 'Verschiebungen seit dem Jahre 1000'.

A glance at the general maps shows how often wide-ranging developments coincide in France. The different kinds of cross-hatching are overlaid in an intricate pattern. The reason in some cases of moment is assuredly that the change has originated in France and has radiated outward in western Romania. This is an aspect of the 'rise of the Romance peoples' to which, I think, more attention should be given. More important than the Germanic invaders were the developments which arose within Latin itself, the unity of the language being disrupted by fresh waves of innovation from Gaul.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Une Philosophie et une Morale du Sentiment: Luc de Clapiers, Marquis de Vauvenargues. By FERNAND VIAL. Paris: Droz. 1938. 304 pp.

Vauvenargues est en faveur, depuis quelques années. Il avait inspiré jadis à Voltaire une vive admiration mêlée d'affection sincère; puis il était rentré dans la pénombre des écrivains secondaires du 18^e siècle. Et cela dura jusqu'à l'édition Gilbert (1857), qui fit connaître des inédits et ramena sur lui l'attention. Depuis dix ans, particulièrement, les études se succèdent, biographiques ou littéraires.¹ M. Vial ne s'interdit pas de rappeler les circonstances lamentables de la vie de Vauvenargues, dans la mesure où elles éclairent sa pensée ou sa personnalité mais l'objet propre du livre est d'exposer la philosophie du moraliste: il s'agit de démontrer l'unité philosophique de cette œuvre, 'que les nombreux commentateurs n'ont souvent réussi qu'à obscurcir davantage'.

L'entreprise n'est pas sans difficulté. Les écrits de Vauvenargues ont une valeur très inégale. Certains, comme l'*Eloge de Louis XV* ou le *Discours sur l'inégalité*, sont des œuvres de circonstance ou des essais académiques dont on peut douter qu'ils représentent vraiment la pensée de l'écrivain. D'autres semblent être de purs exercices littéraires. Quant aux pensées détachées, où l'on trouve peut-être le plus d'originalité et d'intimité, elles sont, comme les *Pensées* de Pascal, les éléments épars d'une œuvre que la mort a interrompue. Enfin et surtout le vocabulaire philosophique de Vauvenargues manque de précision. Préoccupé de morale pratique, il se sentait mal à l'aise dans la spéculation pure. Il faut,

¹ Cf. les ouvrages de May Wallas (1928), de G. Lanson (1930), de P. Richard (1930), de P. Trahard (1931-1933), de G. Saintville (1931-1933) et de S. Rocheblave (1934), que M. Vial indique dans sa bibliographie.

quand on le commente, définir, à mesure qu'il les emploie, ces termes de *nature*, de *bonté*, de *vertu*, de *passion*, de *mérite*, de *gloire*, qui sont susceptibles d'acceptions diverses, et auxquels il n'attache pas toujours un sens fixe. Le commentaire de M. Vial s'applique à dégager de cette confusion une philosophie cohérente et constante.

M. Vial analyse d'abord les principes de la philosophie de Vauvenargues, puis il expose sa morale. L'idée maîtresse est que la nature humaine est foncièrement bonne: cette bonté se manifeste par les évidences du sentiment et de l'instinct auxquelles l'homme peut et devrait se fier. Sceptique à l'égard de tout dogme religieux ou de tout criterium rationnel, Vauvenargues affirme la valeur pratique des impulsions naturelles qui commandent l'action, et par l'action se réalise la vertu, c'est-à-dire le développement vigoureux de la personnalité selon la nature. Ces étapes de la pensée de Vauvenargues sont commentées en détail dans une série de chapitres qui s'intitulent: *bonté de la nature, les qualités naturelles, scepticisme spéculatif et dogmatisme pratique, raison et sentiment, le sentiment, la passion, l'action, Vauvenargues stoïque, la gloire*. La deuxième partie (morale de Vauvenargues) se divise en quatre chapitres: *l'utilitarisme, morale individuelle, morale sociale, morale religieuse*.

L'idée n'était peut-être pas très heureuse de distinguer aussi formellement la pensée théorique de la doctrine morale chez un écrivain qui est essentiellement un moraliste, soucieux de directions utiles, et plus observateur que métaphysicien. M. Vial reconnaît lui-même (p. 139) que Vauvenargues n'expose pas ses théories avec la rigueur qu'exigerait la méthode philosophique, mais d'une manière pratique 'qui est la marque spéciale de ce génie utilitariste'. En fait le cadre que le commentateur impose à ses analyses n'est pas sans inconvénients. Sans parler de répétitions, qui devenaient inévitables, on trouve dans la première partie certains développements, sur l'éducation, par exemple, ou sur la vie de société, qui empiètent sur la seconde: inversement M. Vial réserve pour la fin de son livre l'étude des idées religieuses, qu'on attendrait beaucoup plut tôt, puisqu'il s'agit de métaphysique, et dont il a d'ailleurs parlé précédemment dans la première partie (pp. 173-84). Il résulte aussi de cette disposition que certains problèmes généraux, que pose l'œuvre de Vauvenargues, ne sont pas traités avec toute la cohésion désirable: sur la question de la liberté morale, par exemple, les commentaires qui tendent à élucider la pensée de l'auteur sont dispersés en une dizaine de passages, soit dans la première, soit dans la seconde partie. Au moins aurait-il fallu compléter l'index des noms propres par un index analytique.

Pour en venir maintenant à la 'thèse' de M. Vial, a-t-il prouvé que 'tout se tient dans la philosophie et la morale de Vauvenargues', et que sur cette notion fondamentale de la bonté de la nature l'auteur a édifié un système philosophique cohérent? Sa démonstration n'est pas convaincante.

Et d'abord cette formule 'bonté de la nature' est-elle tout à fait satisfaisante pour représenter la pensée de Vauvenargues? Elle est pour le moins équivoque, en tant qu'elle suggère une idée morale de perfection originelle, alors que Vauvenargues a dans l'esprit la notion de bienfaisance

pratique et d'utilité. Il se fonde sur l'expérience: il affirme que les forces naturelles dont nous disposons, le sentiment, l'instinct, la passion, sont, même dans l'état d'imperfection de l'homme actuel, foncièrement saines, vraies, bienfaisantes: de sorte que si l'homme suivait la 'route naturelle' et se conformait, pour les développer, aux dispositions originales et fondamentales de son être, indépendamment de toute interférence de la raison ou du dogme, le bonheur individuel et le progrès social pourraient être réalisés. Dans ce sens, sans doute, on a le droit de dire que la nature est 'bonne'. En fait, pourtant, cette formule 'bonté de la nature' est couramment employée, et à plus juste titre, pour définir la doctrine sensiblement différente qui affirme comme un postulat, ou comme un article de foi, que 'tout est bien sortant des mains de l'auteur des choses'. C'est à ce naturisme mystique que la formule devrait être réservée, afin qu'aucune confusion ne soit possible entre la perfection du primitif, telle que la conçoit Rousseau, et cet ensemble de forces utiles que Vauvenargues constate, même dans l'homme actuel, et auxquelles il fait confiance, en dépit de leur imperfection reconnue. M. Vial lui-même signale l'équivoque lorsqu'il remarque (p. 25) que 'les épithètes de bon et de mauvais ne conviennent pas du tout, moralement, à ces forces brutes qui ne sont que la matière de nos actes'.

Sur cette notion de bonté naturelle, ainsi conçue, peut-on édifier une philosophie cohérente qui serait celle de Vauvenargues? Toute conception naturiste qui veut s'ériger en système se heurte au problème du mal. La difficulté est manifeste si par *bonté de la nature* on entend une perfection, une innocence originelles. Attribuer le mal à l'action ultérieure de la société, comme fait Rousseau, c'est simplement déplacer le problème, la société elle-même étant naturelle. Ne faire confiance qu'au sentiment, et attribuer le mal aux interférences de la raison, comme fait volontiers Vauvenargues, c'est encore déplacer simplement le problème, puisque la raison est une donnée naturelle. Vauvenargues l'a bien vu: et comme, sans prétendre édifier un système, il avait cependant, dit M. Vial, 'un besoin inconscient de logique profonde', il finit par admettre expressément que la nature n'est ni parfaite ni innocente, qu'elle est un mélange 'de faiblesse et de force', et qu'elle a 'ses vices',—ce qui, au reste, n'empêche pas qu'elle ne soit, dans son ensemble, vraie, utile et pratiquement bienfaisante. Alors, sans doute, le problème de l'apparition du mal dans la nature ne se pose plus: le bien et le mal sont donnés originairement: la bonté de la nature se réduit à une prédominance d'éléments utiles dans les données naturelles. Mais d'autres problèmes surgissent, métaphysiques ou moraux. Comment concilier cette dualité naturelle avec la conception panthéiste que Vauvenargues semble se faire du monde? Comment fonder une morale individuelle et sociale sur un criterium aussi empirique, aussi relatif et instable que l'utilité? M. Vial, plus préoccupé, semble-t-il, que Vauvenargues lui-même, de ne pas diminuer le prestige de la nature, et de maintenir à la base du système l'idée d'une nature purement bienfaisante, sans mélange initiale de 'vices', explique qu'il ne faut pas confondre, chez Vauvenargues, la nature avec le naturel humain, et finalement distingue (p. 41) une nature no 1, parfaitement bienfaisante,

d'une nature no. 2, où apparaissent des imperfections, et d'une nature no. 3 qui est le naturel, mêlé de bien et de mal. Mais outre que ces distinctions ne sont pas faites, ni même indiquées expressément par Vauvenargues, elles ne résolvent pas le problème de cette apparition de forces naturelles malfaisantes parmi des forces naturelles utiles. La contamination d'une nature utile par une nature nuisible dans le naturisme pragmatique de Vauvenargues, n'est pas moins mystérieuse que n'est, dans le naturisme mystique de Rousseau, la contamination de la perfection originelle par le mal moral.

Ces réserves faites, et à la condition de ne pas résoudre pour le moraliste des problèmes qu'il n'a pas résolus, on peut admettre avec M. Vial que la notion de forces naturelles foncièrement bonnes représente la direction maîtresse de la pensée de Vauvenargues. Sa morale est essentiellement un retour au sentiment, à l'instinct, à la passion, en réaction contre tous les éléments artificiels qui sont introduits dans la vie par la morale traditionnelle, le dogme, la vie sociale ou l'intérêt mal compris. Miss May Wallas avait insisté, avec raison, sur ce non-conformisme de Vauvenargues comme point de départ de sa pensée positive.

Mais indépendamment des difficultés que soulève cette direction initiale, peut-on dire que 'tout se tienne' dans la philosophie de Vauvenargues? En fait son commentateur se heurte à des obscurités, à des pensées contradictoires. Comment aboutir à une théorie précise de la connaissance en partant de ces textes épars qui tantôt font du sentiment le principe de la connaissance supérieure, tantôt donnent à la raison autant de valeur qu'au sentiment? Comment concilier ces affirmations: 'la vérité est l'utile': 'toutes les vérités sont éternelles'? Comment construire, ou même esquisser, une métaphysique qui 'se tienne' sur des pensées qui suggèrent une conception panthéistique du monde, et parfois rappellent Spinoza, quand des pensées voisines expriment avec un accent poignant le bonheur de la foi en un Dieu personnel? Comment décider entre le déterminisme que Vauvenargues affirme, et la liberté qu'il voudrait sauvegarder comme base nécessaire de la morale? Comment concilier la notion de bonté naturelle, même réduite à l'utilité, avec l'affirmation de la malfaisance naturelle de l'homme (*homo homini lupus*), ou l'idéal cher à Vauvenargues d'indulgence et de pitié humaines avec son apologie de la guerre? Parfois M. Vial admet ces obscurités, ces contradictions: ailleurs il s'efforce d'en atténuer l'importance ou de les réduire par des distinctions. Mais Vauvenargues ne s'en défendait pas. 'Si l'on trouve, disait-il, que je me contredis, je réponds: parce que je me suis trompé une fois, je ne prétends pas me tromper toujours' (texte cité par M. Vial, p. 8). Pourquoi le faire plus un et plus systématique qu'il n'est, puisqu'il nous invite lui-même à voir dans son œuvre les mouvements d'une pensée qui s'organise, se rectifie, cherche son équilibre, et qui note ses démarches, sans se croire tenue de s'immobiliser sur des positions qu'elle a dépassées? N'est-il pas naturel que ce jeune moraliste, mort à 32 ans, ait laissé des écrits rebelles à toute unification systématique, que ce 'naturaliste de la morale', comme disait Nietzsche de Montaigne, ait encore le regret de la foi, que ce fataliste ait besoin de croire à la

liberté, que cet ascète infirme rêve d'action, que cet utilitaire ait de l'utilité une conception si élevée qu'un idéaliste ne la renierait pas? Sans doute ce serait faire injure à son œuvre que d'y voir une sorte de 'journal' reflétant simplement des dispositions quotidiennes: mais c'est aller à l'extrême contraire que de vouloir construire une doctrine cohérente à l'aide de ces fragments. *Pendent opera interrupta*, comme dirent les Solitaires quand ils publièrent les *Pensées* de Pascal. Au reste l'œuvre ne perd rien de son intérêt à n'être pas une architecture: une personnalité singulièrement attachante revit dans ces matériaux épars.

Dans une conclusion dont la sobriété contraste avec l'ampleur parfois surabondante des commentaires qui la précèdent, M. Vial s'applique à situer Vauvenargues dans l'histoire des idées. En fait, cet indépendant touche à trois siècles. Son goût est du dix-septième siècle, comme aussi ses vues aristocratiques sur le rôle de la noblesse. Par son scepticisme en matière de religion il est du temps de Fontenelle et de Voltaire: pourtant son athéisme ne prend pas un ton sarcastique ou agressif, et cette réserve le distingue. Par sa répugnance pour la vie de société, par son individualisme, par sa confiance dans la nature et dans l'instinct, par ce que M. Seillière appellerait son mysticisme passionnel et son impérialisme, il devance Rousseau et le romantisme. Il annonce même les formes extrêmes du romantisme et conçoit déjà l'idéal nietzschéen du surhomme qui choisit de 'vivre dangereusement'.

Le livre de M. Vial sera utile. On peut regretter qu'il ait voulu soutenir une thèse qui l'entraînait à peu près inévitablement à exagérer l'unité et la cohésion des idées de Vauvenargues, plutôt que d'exposer, sans intention préconçue, et dans leur complexité irréductible, les courants de pensée qui animent son œuvre. Il n'en est pas moins vrai que cet ouvrage est actuellement le commentaire le plus détaillé que nous ayons de cette œuvre:¹ on y trouvera des analyses pénétrantes: on y recueillera aussi beaucoup d'indications utiles, encore qu'éparses, sur les sources de Vauvenargues, et sur les rapports de sa pensée avec celle des philosophes contemporains.

E. EGLI.

LIVERPOOL.

¹ Dans le détail certains commentaires de M. Vial appelleraient des observations; par exemple:

p. 135. 'Tous les écrits de Shaftesbury passent en français aussitôt qu'ils apparaissent, c'est-à-dire entre 1708 et 1711'. Ces dates ne sont exactes ni si elles désignent les éditions anglaises de Shaftesbury, ni si elles concernent les traductions françaises. Cf. l'article d'E. Casati *Hérauts et commentateurs de Shaftesbury en France*, dans la *Revue de Littérature comparée* d'octobre-décembre 1934.

p. 246 M. Vial, se référant à *l'Esprit des lois*, l. 1, ch. 2, prête à Montesquieu un raisonnement étrange sur l'homme primitif: 'Puisqu'il n'y avait pas de lois, il ne pouvait y avoir de violations, donc l'homme était bon. C'était un sauvage paisible et doux'. Montesquieu ne joue pas ainsi sur les sens du mot *bon*. Il y a lieu de penser, dit-il, que l'homme primitif était paisible et doux, non pas parce qu'il n'y avait pas de lois, mais parce que, en fait, et d'après des cas constatés, le sauvage est un être faible et craintif.

La langue de M. Vial n'est pas toujours très sûre. Il emploie des mots qui ne sont pas français: habilité (p. 82), obtainable (125), inconclusif (166 et 194). On relève aussi des anglicismes: préoccupation pour des problèmes (102), confronté par des difficultés financières (112), demeures élaborées (134), actuellement (=en fait) (240), référence (=mention, allusion) (168 et *passim*).

Stendhal. By F. C. GREEN. Cambridge: University Press. 1939. 336 pp. 12s. 6d.

Critics of Stendhal have tended in the past to adopt one of two equally extreme standpoints. Some, using him as a means of demonstrating their own perspicacity, and having no doubts as to their membership of the 'happy few', have hailed even the most insignificant fragment as a masterpiece of subtlety. Others, the makers of systems, have labelled Stendhal as a Romantic, attributing any awkward discrepancies to the protective armour of brutal irony assumed by a sensitive and disappointed soul. Professor Green steers a middle course, avoiding the esoteric pose and putting forward no startlingly new theories. His sense of proportion saves him from blind admiration for everything Stendhal wrote and he goes so far as to separate the grain from the chaff when, for instance, he dismisses the Italian stories (*Vittoria Accoramboni*, etc.) as pot-boilers violent and unreal as any Romantic excesses. But neither is he so naive as to try to explain away Stendhal as a clear case of inferiority complex.

The reason for this fine balance is the author's indebtedness to recent research, a debt which he freely acknowledges in his preface. During the last few years the fund of material has increased immeasurably. Not only have the Champion edition and the work of such men as Martino, Royer, Jourda, Blum, Rod and Arbelet (not Arbalet as he is called in this book) extended the boundaries of biographical and literary knowledge but, most important of all, the Divan edition, completed in 1938 under the editorship of H. Martineau, has brought within reach correspondence, diaries and fragments hitherto difficult of access. It would hardly be an exaggeration, and it is no disparagement of Professor Green's erudition, to say that this book is the fruit of research carried out under the auspices of the Divan. And, indeed, therein lies its value to students and general readers.

All this material, skilfully marshalled and freely quoted, serves both to give detail and continuity to the biographical information and to throw light on the works themselves, for Professor Green believes that the writings of Stendhal are in the highest degree autobiographical, if not as a chronicle of events at least as a revelation of his intellectual and sentimental evolution. Hence the method adopted: instead of the obvious division into 'life' and 'works', Professor Green performs the far more difficult feat of fitting everything into a single mosaic in which each element explains the others and each work is to be found in its chronological and psychological context.

In the resulting synthesis, while avoiding tedious headings and subdivisions, the author succeeds in discussing in their appropriate places various questions that present themselves to any student of Stendhal. For example, in chapter VI, in addition to some account of Stendhal's life between 1821 and 1830, *Racine et Shakespeare*, *De l'Amour*, *La Vie de Rossini*, the articles in English periodicals and parts of the *Souvenirs d'Egotisme* are utilized as a basis for examining the extent to which Stendhal is autobiographical and the complicated question of his position

in relation to the main stream of Romanticism. Starting from the definition in *Racine et Shakespeare* that 'art is great only in so far as it expresses with energy and clarity the truly profound and significant actions, passions and sensations of its own era', Professor Green points out how wide were the divergences between what Stendhal understood by Romantic literature and the theory and practice of the French Romantics in general. This threefold ideal of truth, clarity and contemporaneity explains why Stendhal despised so much that was going on around him: the higher metaphysics ('le galimatias allemand que beaucoup de gens appellent romantique'), the pseudo-history, the indecent exposure of one's private life, the shrill emotional note and the new rhetoric which in his opinion was worse than what it sought to replace. For all these things were spurious and often the opposite of clear. But Professor Green shrewdly notes the inconsistency of Stendhal's contempt for subjectivity in poetry for, in spite of the cleverness of his disguises, the author of *De l'Amour* lays bare more of his inner life than any of the lyric poets.

In his admirable analyses of the novels Professor Green unobtrusively but persistently adds evidence in support of the thesis that with advancing age Stendhal had less and less in common with the Romantics. By his preoccupation with human truth, his subtle analysis of character, his hatred of exaggeration and cult of the simple and economical in form, his dislike of the merely picturesque and preference for lightly drawn and purely psychological local colour Stendhal, as depicted in this book, is in the unchanging French tradition, his genius 'has fused the local and the universal into something which carried the stamp of immortality, or classic art'.

It seems that biographers have to choose between the two evils of chronological obscurity and muddling diffusion of a given topic. Professor Green wisely prefers to deal whenever possible with the whole of a subject in one place; this very real gain is, however, only achieved at the cost of some darting to and fro over the years. But if it is not always easy to know in which year 'the following March' or 'a month later' occur, the far more important thing, logical order in the presentation of subjects, is always admirably realized. The large number of footnotes and references in the text makes the usual criticism about the lack of a formal bibliography almost carping.

Professor Green states in his preface that this is the first full-length study of Stendhal to have appeared in English for upwards of sixty years. He has filled the gap with a standard work which bears comparison with any of the French ones.

L. W. TANCOCK.

LONDON.

Théodore Barrière, dramatist of the Second Empire. By EDWIN COLBY BYAM. (*The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages.* Extra Volume XIII.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1938. 338 pp. 14s.

Théodore Barrière est un homme heureux. Il a trouvé le plus attentif,

le plus scrupuleux, le plus exact des commentateurs. M. Byam a poussé ses recherches jusqu'à l'extrême limite de la minutie. Il ne nous fait grâce ni d'une date ni d'un chiffre,¹ et ne nous laisse ignorer aucun des changements d'adresse de l'écrivain, il ne nous manque que ses notes de blanchisseuse. M. Byam analyse en long et en large une multitude de pièces et reproduit à leur sujet les jugements de la critique contemporaine. Sa bibliographie est 'exhaustive' à souhait, ne comprenant pas moins de quarante grandes pages, et l'on se demande parfois s'il ne conviendrait pas d'intituler son ouvrage: 'Tout ce qu'il faut savoir de Théodore Barrière.'

Emprisons-nous d'ajouter que M. Byam n'a pas été écrasé par sa documentation dont il porte aisément le poids. Il a su garder son équilibre et il demeure maître de sa matière.

Barrière restera l'auteur des *Filles de Marbre*, des *Parisiens*, et surtout des *Faux Bonshommes*, pièce à propos de laquelle on a prononcé le nom de Mohère, qui annonce le 'théâtre rosse', et appartient à un genre—le 'money play'—où depuis ont brillé Hervieu, Fabre, de Curel et Mirbeau. Ce qui élève Barrière au-dessus du niveau commun, c'est son observation impitoyable des mœurs, à une époque où tant d'auteurs dramatiques sont des élèves de Scribe, simples monteurs ou mécaniciens. Il a créé des caractères vrais et soutenus. Il diffère aussi de quelques-uns de ses confrères plus illustres qui écrivent des pièces à thèse. Lui, ne se fait pas réformateur social et ne cherche pas à modifier les lois. La leçon morale, chez lui, est implicite et 'passe' avec le dénouement, sans qu'il soit besoin de la mettre en vedette par toutes sortes d'artifices. Notons toutefois qu'il nous présente un type devenu populaire, Desgenais le *raisonneur*.

Nous lisons dans la conclusion de M. Byam les lignes suivantes: 'Of his prolific production there remains but little to interest the student of the drama: only two or three plays in their entirety and fragments of a few others.' Certains trouveront que c'est trop de 269 pages pour étayer pareille conclusion: nous ne sommes pas de cet avis, car, en faisant route, causant et devisant, M. Byam touche à bien des questions et remue bien des choses. On lui saura gré d'avoir si judicieusement montré que l'œuvre de Barrière est une collection de documents sur l'histoire des mœurs du Second Empire. 'Barrière as a critical observer of his contemporaries remains as a documentary source even if Barrière as moralist and dramatist has perished.'

L'époque elle-même revit dans les pages de M. Byam qui se distingue non seulement par la science du détail, mais par un sentiment très juste du milieu historique, et un goût littéraire averti.

J. DECHAMPS.

LONDON.

¹ Exemple. 'In 1875 Barrière was performed more than 186 times on four stages; in 1876, at least 127 times on five, and in 1877, 91 times on four.'

Louis-Sébastien Mercier in Germany. By W. W. PUSEY. (*Columbia University Germanic Studies*, VIII.) New York Columbia University Press, London: H. Milford. 1939. 243 pp. 15s. 6d.

This book attempts a comprehensive study of Mercier's relationship to German literature and of the change in the nature of his appeal during the last third of the eighteenth century. Four years after Lessing's death and the appearance of Schiller's *Räuber*, and four years before the French Revolution, this Frenchman's German vogue reached its zenith; at the time of Goethe's *Naturliche Tochter* and of Klopstock's and Herder's death his star was on the wane. Mercier died one year before the Battle of Waterloo. These dates are significant. W. W. Pusey's most careful study, completed under the direction of R. H. Fife of Columbia University, takes cognizance of previous research on Mercier by Léon Mis, Rosanow and Zollinger; the author, moreover, draws important material from other sources: 'Theaterarchive', Meusel's *Gelehrtes Deutschland*, Grethlein's *Theaterkatalog*, Heinsius's and Kayser's *Bucher-Lexikon*, etc. A most enlightening appendix offers a list of translations and imitations of Mercier's plays, novels, and essays, also a special list of works which have definitely no connexion with Mercier. W. W. Pusey's painstaking work fills an urgent need in our literary research, if only for the fact that according to Reichard's (*Theater-Kalender*) list of the performances on fourteen different German stages in 1776, Mercier's *Essigmann* is 'in second place with forty-eight presentations' (twenty more than Lessing's *Minna*!). Even if Reichard's count were not reliable, Mercier's popularity was doubtless considerable, as is proved in the chapters about 'Sturm und Drang', Wieland, Goethe, Schiller, etc., and by the imitations of Mercier by Schroder, Iffland, and Dalberg. We hear that in the last three decades of the eighteenth century 'at least 75 editions of Mercier in German were published . . . , six appearing in 1778 alone' (p. 24).

The author aptly singles out the play *La Brouette du Vinaigrier* as Mercier's greatest success in Germany, even greater than that of the *Déserteur*. The Utopia, *L'An 2440*, an invective against intolerance and tyranny, which was translated by C. F. Weisse and used by Wieland for his *Goldener Spiegel*, which adopts however a milder tone, and the *Tableau de Paris*, can also claim remarkable popularity. The most convincing proof of Mercier's German vogue is presented by three German works which are adaptations of Mercier and which were translated back into French! i.e. *Olinde et Sophronie* (an adaptation of Cronegk's play and translated into German by d'Arien), *Jezennemours* (an imitation of *Agathon* and translated several times into German), K. H. Heydenreich's translation of Mercier's adaptation of Zimmermann's *Über die Einsamkeit*.

The author avoids the danger of overstating Mercier's importance for Germany. Only now and then he seems to go further than we should be inclined to do, especially as regards the influence of Mercier's *Du Théâtre, ou Nouvel essai sur l'art dramatique* on Goethe's *Theatralische Sendung* (p. 115 ff.); cf. also B. Seuffert, *Goethes Theater-Roman*, Graz, 1924. Altogether, this chapter seems to us worth revising (pp. 121, 134, etc.). Schiller's debt to Mercier seems to be overrated in spite of certain

reservations (p. 147). But, on the whole, this work stands out as a very serious and well-balanced contribution to the comparative study of literary epochs at the end of the eighteenth century, and is successful in setting off Mercier against Diderot and Beaumarchais. The reasons of Mercier's vogue are clearly shown: his love of virtue, his realistic description, his creed of humanity, and above all his existence as 'one of the few Frenchmen of his time who was willing to admit that German literature existed at all' (p. 208)! With the exception of a few misprints the work is very well produced, and does credit to the Germanic Studies of Columbia University.

AUGUST CLOSS.

BRISTOL.

Letters of Anna Jameson to Ottilie von Goethe. Edited by G. H. NEEDLER. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1939. 247 pp. 15s.

These letters, few of which had been printed before, have been copied by Professor Needler from the originals preserved in the Goethe and Schiller Archives in Weimar, and provided with a brief introduction and copious, mainly biographical notes. They begin with the year 1833, when Mrs Jameson was thirty-nine and Ottilie thirty-seven, and continue till within a month of the writer's death in 1860. Mrs Jameson never saw Goethe, as the two women first met in Weimar in 1833, but Ottilie enjoyed a reflected glory from her close association with the great man. From this impersonal attraction there grew a deep personal affection, which enabled Mrs Jameson, in spite of her fundamentally conventional nature, to stand loyally by Ottilie through the scandal caused by the greatest of her indiscretions.

The authoress was on terms of more or less close intimacy with countless celebrities both in England and Germany, and many famous names are found in these letters. She knew, among others, Wordsworth, Carlyle and Macaulay, and was so familiar with the Brownings that she spent a month with them in Paris, while one of her high spots was the occasion when she 'breakfasted with *Moore and Rogers*, us three, no more'. She belonged to that British intelligentsia of the day which had an unbounded admiration for Germany and all things German. Thus, writing of Sarah Austin, she says: 'She is a singular woman, and has a *German* mind, which I suppose attracts me.' Or again: 'And still Germany and my German friends remain the objects in my distant prospect to which all my plans and all my longings tend.'

She knew all the chief admirers and interpreters of German literature in England, and one of the interesting things in the letters is the account given of the first impressions made by Lewes's *Life of Goethe*. She apparently knew Crabb Robinson very well, and an editorial footnote is appended concerning him, though we should perhaps hardly guess his importance in this connexion from the description, 'English diarist and journalist. Among his many notable acquaintances was Goethe.'

For Canadians the book has a special interest, not only on account of the important administrative post held in Canada by Mrs Jameson's husband, but also for the interesting account of her own impressions in her well-known *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada*. It was well worth while to render these letters so conveniently accessible, and the editor has given just the help and guidance necessary to make of them a very readable book.

H. G. ATKINS.

LONDON.

Der deutsche Dichter um die Jahrhundertwende und seine Abgelöstheit von der Gesellschaft. By HANS WILHELM ROSENHAUPT. (*Sprache und Dichtung*, Heft 66.) Bern-Leipzig: Haupt. 1939. 287 pp. 9 fr.

In this book Dr Rosenhaupt makes an interesting attempt to explain sociologically some striking features in German literature round about 1900. The leading writers of this period, among whom he gives special attention to Rilke, George, Hofmannsthal, Thomas Mann and Gerhart Hauptmann, were conscious of being divided by a deep gulf from the middle-class society of their day. They were therefore for ever criticizing the world around them, they felt themselves to be lonely and different from their fellows, and they did not so much express their age as react against it. As they had no roots in the life of their time, they saw themselves in the role of wanderers, without any function in life or any hold on it, or else as heirs of an overwhelming past, already half in love with death. As their world was a thing of shreds and patches, their attitude to it was in the main that of escapists. They and their heroes led an irresponsible 'Inseldasein' as dreamers and intellectuals.

These are the characteristics which the author discovers in German literature at the close of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, but Dr Rosenhaupt is not, like most of those who in recent years have made his terms familiar, a hostile critic. Writing in an American university he does not need to express contempt for the authors he discusses as rootless intellectuals. He feels with them and tries to understand them. His work shows a sense of measure. It is perhaps more successful as literary criticism than as sociological explanation. One misses a close analysis of 'Abgelöstheit' as a social phenomenon, and it is a pity that comparisons with other ages have been avoided. For lack of them one cannot fully realize the difference between these writers and the author of 'Werther', or the Romantics, or Heine, or Nietzsche, who all anticipate them in one respect or another. But Dr Rosenhaupt only claims to have applied a new method to a field of inquiry that cannot yet be clearly surveyed as a whole. As a first sketch his book is very good, full of sound observations and likely to stimulate further research.

W. H. BRUFORD.

EDINBURGH.

Modern German Literature, 1880-1938. By JETHRO BITHELL. London: Methuen. 1939 535 pp. 18s.

In his preface to *Germany, A Companion to German Studies*, Jethro Bithell spoke of the 'changing orientation of interest in German studies, which may ere long bring us into more productive fields. . . There is, moreover, a marked change coming over the scope of German studies. The intensive study of medieval texts as a philological discipline is yielding to a more practical concern with the "Realien" of the modern period.' His book on *Modern German Literature* may be regarded primarily as a valiant attempt to put such principles into practice, and their vindication.

Mr Bithell modestly describes the present volume as an expansion of the essay on German literature since 1880 which he wrote for the *Companion*, but it is much more than that. Methuens, who are to be congratulated for their enterprise in publishing such a book and for its extremely good production, speak quite rightly of this 'monumental' work. It is indeed a mighty tome, but not a 'tomb', except in so far as it contains the charred remains of several literary reputations, including such varied writers as Gerhart Hauptmann, Paul Ernst, Borries von Münchhausen. Every page is readable, chiefly because the tone is so personal. No matter how familiar the facts and ideas, they are given here in a delightfully characteristic way: severe but not hypercritical, humorous, and often sarcastic. The whole attitude is somehow specifically English: insular if you will, in fact deliberately so. 'At all events I have tried to do justice to all my authors, whether boomed or banned; and, since on this side of the water there could be no question of taking over Nazi valuations, the verdict is in every case my own.' It is a pity one cannot now take the book to Germany and show it to friends, above all to literary Nazis, they would not understand much of it, just as they completely failed to understand Professor Butler's *Tyranny of Greece*, but it would be good fun to tease them with it. One might even suggest that certain sections, e.g. p. 282 (Paul Ernst), pp. 480-83 (Literature of Race and Soil), pp. 498-500 (Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Rosenberg, Hermann Wirth), should be broadcast in the English news in German: as an eye-opener to Nazi hangers-on and docile believers, and to the secret gratification of those stalwarts in Germany who still stand for objectivity in literary criticism.

It is inevitable that such a personal and living treatment should call forth many objections and on occasions downright denials. 'Himmelhoch jauchzend, zum Tode betrübt': such is probably the experience of every specialist, as he turns over the pages. But if he really loves the period, he will be happy; in spite of his desire at times to fling the book aside, and write the author a letter of protest. For here at long last is the truly English survey he has been waiting for; the English complement—and antidote—to Soergel, Naumann, Mahrholz and the rest; the comprehensive work of reference ('and still the wonder grew, that one small head could carry all he knew') to which he can always turn, and the touchstone by which he can test his own pet theories.

The defects of the book may be explained and to a large extent excused by the nature of the task Mr Bithell set himself. To write a literary history of eighty million Germans, including the Swiss and the Auslandsdeutsche, over a period of sixty prolific years, sounds more like a self-imposed penance than a pleasurable hobby. The struggle with such tremendous masses of material, carried on in a foreign language and at such close range, would have overwhelmed a scholar of less industry and courage. Even so, it may be doubted whether one man could ever accomplish the task really satisfactorily, and one is inclined (ungraciously) to wish for a collective work something like Stammler's *Verfasserlexikon des Mittelalters*, with Mr Bithell as editor and chief contributor. This comparison comes readily to mind because the book is in the last resort a long series of pen-portraits, biographical essays. The majority are good; a few, e.g. Stefan George, Hofmannsthal, Liliencron, are masterpieces; but there was bound to be some unevenness of treatment. Sometimes Mr Bithell gives too many personal details, e.g. Paul Heyse (p. 6). More often it is a question of 'Werturteile', the lack of a scale of values (or perhaps it would be fairer to say the impossibility of achieving such a scale as yet). Compared with Christian Morgenstern (pp. 72 ff.), Wilhelm Busch is left very much out in the cold; and compared with either, far too long an account is given of Hans Heinz Ewers (p. 80), whose pornographic productions are forgotten in Germany, and whose patriotic effusions like *Reiter in deutscher Nacht* (1932) and his Horst-Wessel novel (1932) (both of which Mr Bithell fails to mention) are ignored. A great German writer (Wilamowitz?) has declared: 'Vollkommenheit ist der Tod der Wissenschaft'; and Mr Bithell was perhaps unwise in trying to bring everybody in and to mention all their works. For this only increases the difficulty of perspective, and renders the broad outlines and main currents even less distinct. It is of course of tremendous value to have such a complete survey at one's disposal (Robert Hohlbaum is one of the very few important writers left out), but it would probably have been better to concentrate more on the 'Zusammenhänge', to say less about many of the writers and their works, and about some of them nothing at all. This applies particularly to writers and books on those vexed questions of sex, which have played such a great part in recent literature that the literary historian cannot possibly ignore them. But Mr Bithell might have dealt with them all together in one section, and left it at that. This is not puritanism or prudery: it is simply that anything approaching pornography in literature is not worth while.

In all criticisms of this kind, one is thinking not so much of the specialist as of the layman, the newcomer to the period, the young student. With such readers in mind one cannot help feeling doubtful also about the arrangement in some parts of the book. A glance at the table of contents shows that the backbone consists of the 'usually accepted literary movements'—Naturalism, Decadence, Neo-Romanticism, Impressionism, Neo-Classicism, Expressionism, and Neue Sachlichkeit, to which have been added such themes as 'The Women Writers',

'The Historical Novel', 'The War in Literature'. This is all very well as far as it goes, only Mr Bithell might have stressed more that it does not go very far, that these 'Begriffe', however convenient, are very much 'man-made', that they overlap and are in no sense final. Gerhart Hauptmann, for example, is dealt with entirely under the heading 'The Dramatists of Naturalism', which gives a false picture. Wilhelm Schmidtbonn and Eduard Stucken (a Neuromantiker if ever there was one!) appear in the chapter on Neo-Classicism. The essay on Nietzsche is excellent, but it is difficult to see why he should come after Hermann Bahr, in the chapter with the strange title 'From Bahr to Dehmel' (Bahr was a chameleon rather than a milestone).

There are certain minor errors, some of which may be noted here; not in a carping spirit, but for fear they should be overlooked in the second edition. Otto Brahm died in 1912 (p. 17), and Felix Holländer in 1931 (p. 91). Mr Bithell is at great pains to explain the importance of the 'Mittelachse' in the verse of Arno Holz, but unfortunately in the extracts quoted on pp. 23 and 24 the compositor has forgotten to make it visible. On p. 39 (footnote) and p. 304 the titles of Hauptmann's play *Der weisse Heiland* and Stucken's novel *Die weissen Götter* are very much mixed. The collection of religious verse by Rudolf Alexander Schröder (who by the way is worthy of much more detailed treatment than he is given) is (mit Vorbehalt) *Widmungen und Opfer* (not *Widmung*), and his novel is *Der Wanderer und die Heimat* (not *in*) (p. 310). Dietrich Eckart did not die in prison (p. 478), but was released by the (too?) kindly authorities because he was ill; at his special request he was taken by friends to Berchtesgaden, where he died. The racialism of to-day (p. 499) definitely goes back farther than Paul de Lagarde; it is to be found, for example, in the writings of Wolfgang Menzel and Friedrich List.

The bibliography is extensive and well-chosen; it will prove very helpful. The footnotes are the reverse of dry-as-dust, and they alone contain sufficient ideas to provide a Department of German with 'Doktorarbeiten' for a decade.

The book as a whole is an achievement of which the author, the University of London, and German studies in England, may justly be proud. Unless one is very much mistaken, it will give a great stimulus to the study of the period, and be the starting-point of much valuable research.

S. D. STIRK.

EXETER.

SHORT NOTICES

Professor Lane Cooper has revised and collected papers and reviews which have appeared over a number of years (*Aristotelian Papers*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; London: H. Milford. 1939. xi+237 pp. 14s. 6d.) It is a book heartily to be commended to English as much as to American readers. He shows himself a scholar and a humanist of wide learning and discerning enthusiasm. Aristotle's *Poetics* is his love and there is much in this volume in the way of elucidation and illustration of the *Poetics* that should be of permanent value. Professor Cooper's knowledge and appreciation of English literature make him particularly fitted for the exposition of a work which, the more we study it, impresses us more and more by its profound significance, a work which is not only invaluable to us in our survey of that limited field that was known to its author, but also of scarcely less value for our understanding of literature, and indeed of art in general. It has been claimed that in Aristotle we find at once the most penetrating and comprehensive mind the world has ever known, and the few pages of the *Poetics* appear almost inexhaustible in direction and suggestion in the sphere of aesthetic theory. In his opening paper Professor Cooper quotes from the *Prelude* the poet's

Observation of affinities
In objects where no brotherhood exists
To passive Minds.

In the *Poetics* we feel that we are constantly being sent out on voyages of discovery, that we are constantly being led to find affinities in literature and in the principles that underly art, ancient and modern. Professor Cooper admirably justifies his quotation from Wordsworth in papers which, keeping this constantly before us, will always interest and often enlighten his readers.

L. SOLOMON.

LONDON.

Dr W. Mackay Mackenzie's edition of *The Kingis Quair* (London: Faber. 1939. 163 pp. 7s. 6d.) is characteristically thorough; if there is not a great deal of new material, at least there is a much more impartial and logical attitude to the old. In his Introduction, for instance, Dr Mackenzie analyses very carefully all the evidence concerning the authorship of the poem, and, negative though his findings may be, one may safely say that he has brought more knowledge of Scottish history and literature to bear upon this vexed question than any other editor. And this though he does not mention the letters supposed to be by James I printed in the *Douglas Book*, which also form a curious linguistic mixture.

He points out, also, that the system of expansion of contractions has previously not been in accordance with Scottish palaeography, and by emending the text clears it of a number of ambiguities. The notes are a

judicious blend of the best of previous scholarship and the fruits of Dr Mackenzie's own (one might mention in particular the notes on *abate*, *gude partye*, *martris and confessor*, *sleuth*, and *Impis*), and the glossary is perfectly adequate.

One could have wished that Dr Mackenzie had said more about the manuscript; his section tails off rather weakly here. That it remained an essentially Scottish collection may be demonstrated from the fact that its later contents include two popular songs, of which evangelical versions appear in that curious publication the *Gude and Godly Ballads*.

A. MACDONALD.

NEWCASTLE.

Professor H. B. Charlton's British Academy Shakespeare Lecture ('*Romeo and Juliet*' as an *Experimental Tragedy*. London: H. Milford. 1939. 45 pp. 2s. 6d.) deals mainly with abstract conceptions of tragic pleasure, sources and analogues of *Romeo and Juliet*, and the experiment of writing tragedy upon a fictitious story and characters, upon 'a boy and girl in a novel'. 'To choose such folk for tragedy was aesthetically well-nigh an anarchist's gesture' (p. 13). His conclusion is that 'the experiment carried Shakespeare no nearer to the heart of tragedy' (p. 45). Professor Charlton gives a full account of some of the earlier versions of the tale, tracing the development of the feud-element—a valuable discussion.

Should such technical terms of sexual pathology as 'sadist' and 'masochist' enter into discussions of aesthetic principles (p. 3)? Why 'masochist', by the way, in preference to the older 'flagellant'? Even if we use 'sadism' vaguely to mean 'cruelty' (a pseudo-psychological fad of the day), can it have any real bearing upon the aesthetic pleasure of normal people? Professor Charlton, who has long moved in the realms of critical gold, rightly describes such explanations as 'repellent to human sentiment'. But can they ever have been put forward by any sane or instructed person?

C. J. SISSON.

LONDON.

The essays by Professor G. Wilson Knight collected in *The Burning Oracle: Studies in the poetry of action* (London: Oxford University Press. 1939. vi+292 pp. 12s. 6d.) are devoted to Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Swift, Pope and Byron. The theory of creativity which underlies them, already exploited in other works by the same writer, for instance *Atlantic Crossing*, presupposes an interplay of two forces symbolized as Eros and Christianity, in other words of material and spiritual 'action and passivity, the vital and the rigid, time and eternity'. The conflicting elements of sensual and spiritual being which remain fluid and divided in Spenser, Shakespeare resolves into integrity through holding the balance between them. 'Milton tilts it one way, Swift, in scorn, the other. Pope in an attempt to inject a new positive through a virulent personal and impersonal attack, and Byron in his greater plays and *Don Juan*, cut out

directions of the highest importance.' The technique, as well as the substance of poetry, is conditioned by the poet's reaction to the rival claims of Eros and Christianity; thus 'Milton attempts through a verbal technique to master final antagonisms that do not exist, as such, for the others, except, perhaps, for Byron, who aims to resolve them on a deeper level'. Professor Knight's dualism resembles that of D. H. Lawrence and J. C. Powys, whose *Glastonbury Romance* he considers to be 'perhaps the greatest work of our generation'. His application of the theory to literary criticism entails a good deal of special pleading and occasions some distinctly naive comments on the writers under consideration. Apparently he prefers the 'vital flame' of Pope and the 'two eternities' of Byron to the 'frozen labyrinth' of Milton, personal preferences against which no objection need be taken. But the 'Shakespearean' traits detected in Pope and Byron are unduly forced, and few readers are likely to concur with the opinions that 'in *Windsor Forest* Pope is already a poet of first importance', that in Epistle II of *An Essay on Man* 'the psychologist thesis is very modern and well beyond the thinking of Pope's day', that 'Shakespeare and Byron are our two greatest masters of tragedy', and so forth. Laboured theory and strained analogy have seriously impaired the value of a work which nevertheless contains much penetrating criticism and vigorous writing. The essays on Shakespeare and Byron, in particular, will repay close study as suggesting a new outlook and method of approach. The book should have contained an index.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

LONDON.

In this penultimate volume (*The History of the English Novel. The Day Before Yesterday*. London: H. F. and G. Witherby. 1938. 364 pp. 16s.), Dr E. A. Baker has shown no diminution of his proficiency. We can legitimately demand more subtlety from the author of a monograph on a single novelist, but it would be absurd to expect a Jamesian intricacy from the historian of the English novel. So wide-ranging an explorer needs toughness, rather than subtlety, of fibre; he has to be able to discuss and pronounce on Ronald Firbank and Israel Zangwill equally with Hardy, Gissing and George Moore, and to weigh debts to French and Russian novelists as well as to English. (In this connexion I have noted one omission: Dr Baker does not note the influence of George Borrow on Moore's style of narration.) Through all these varied tests Dr Baker comes with flying colours. He sees his subject-matter not only as a series of collected works but also as a developing stream of material and treatment. And though the chapters on individuals are well-proportioned, efficient and effective (that on Gissing is exceptionally so — though Dr Baker errs in stating that it is the married sister in the *Odd Women* who takes to drink), though they abound in *bon mots* ('Hardy shows more insight . . . than ever before into his favourite study, the female heart', or 'there is a whole sequence of George Moores, several of his unsuccessful avatars being repudiated. .'), the best things in his

book spring from his knowledge of the whole stream. He 'places' his novelists as a preliminary to examining their achievement; he can see the point of comparing *Tess* with *Esther Waters*; he can write of a love-scene in Gissing as 'one of the most remarkable love-scenes in fiction', or of 'the unprecedented beauty of *The Brook Kerith* and *Héloise and Abélard*'. In making such statements Dr Baker commands our confidence.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

The framework of Mr Cleanth Brooks's *Modern Poetry and the Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1939. xiii+253 pp. 14s.) is an argument to prove that the nineteenth-century Romantic Movement effected a breach with the healthy tradition of English poetry. The thesis is familiar to readers of the critical writings of Dr T. S. Eliot and Dr Leavis. For its purpose the English tradition begins neither with *Beowulf* nor with Chaucer, but with Shakespeare and the seventeenth century. The health of our poetry depends, in this view, upon the fusion of wit and seriousness. Irony is its life-blood and, drained of irony, nineteenth-century poetry was afflicted with a mortal anaemia. The modern poets transfused the blood of the seventeenth century into the dying tradition and so saved it.

Within this framework Mr Brooks examines a selection from the works of the modern English and American poets, some of whom hardly seem to justify the claim that they have renewed, or even understood, the seventeenth-century tradition. But the two most original and important chapters of the book are devoted to major poets, T. S. Eliot and W. B. Yeats. After a careful analysis of the structure and symbols of *The Waste Land* Mr Brooks adumbrates an interpretation which differs from that of his predecessors, with the possible exception of F. O. Matthiesson (in *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot*). The poem has, he declares 'been almost consistently misinterpreted since its first publication'. It is not, in his view, 'a world-weary cry of despair' but the 'rehabilitation of a system of beliefs'. In the chapter on Yeats, Mr Brooks draws the reader's attention to that perplexing prose work *A Vision* and suggests that in it lies the clue to much of the poetry. But he does not succeed, for one reader at any rate, in altering the conviction that the poetry, for all its difficulty, is more lucid as well as infinitely more delightful to read than the prose work.

There will be differences of opinion as to the validity of Mr Brooks's interpretations of particular forms and about the completeness of his account of the English tradition. But, notwithstanding these differences, anyone who is curious about modern poetry, or perplexed by its seemingly revolutionary character, will find his book well worth reading.

CAMBRIDGE.

JOAN BENNETT.

Miss Margaret Goodell's objective study of snobbery, chiefly English snobbery, *Three Satirists of Snobbery: Thackeray, Meredith, Proust* (Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter. 1939. 218 pp. R.M. 9), is competently written and may be a useful contribution to the larger study of the English character which has been a preoccupation of German scholarship for some time now. Not entirely English character, however, for the inclusion of Proust, the greatest specialist on the disease, reminds us that after all snobbery, like music, knows no frontiers. The English variety was first written up, and by masters of the craft of fiction, that is all.

Each country gets the snob it deserves. The English variety is still very much what it was in Thackeray's pages, that is, the rudimentary kind which loves a lord for the wrong reasons. In France this common or garden variety is crossed with the beau or dandy who affects an unusual elegance in dress or bearing, and in Germany what characterizes the snob is 'the affectation of excessive subtlety of taste'—the English highbrow in fact. Among smart people everywhere the last meaning of the word is beginning to push out the earlier senses. The snobbery of Major Pendennis is too obvious to amuse us much now when we have the snobs of surrealism and other cults to consider.

All this Miss Goodell brings out with praiseworthy tact. Her chapters on Thackeray and Meredith are a natural starting-point for a thesis which is mainly literary. If she had had more knowledge of nineteenth-century England outside these authors her thesis would have been even more valuable than it is, but one must not ask for too much.

Of the three authors treated perhaps the Proust is best done. *À La Recherche du Temps Perdu* is a penetrating and often cruel analysis of every variety of snobbery, but here also emerges in the character of the narrator Marcel (who is Proust, with reservations) the 'poetry of snobbery' which might be extended to a defence of snobbery of a more vulgar sort. Miss Goodell has not forgotten this defence of snobbery which creeps into the savage analysis of Thackeray and Meredith too. And that is a good thing, for a vice which has so penetrated English society needs some cheerful explaining away. Nor is the defence of snobbery mere paradox. In all these matters Miss Goodell is a reliable guide.

GEORGE KITCHEN.

EDINBURGH.

How simple, how orderly, and how transparent the work of a French critic can be! Dr Georges Lafourcade, in his study of Arnold Bennett (*Arnold Bennett, a study*. London: Frederick Muller. 1939. 300 pp. 12s. 6d.), handles with ease his mass of detail, his facts, his problems, and his paradoxes. In 300 pages he spares space for notice of even the slight journalistic writings, and brings more than the 135 novels and short stories into summary review, yet, nevertheless, holds the critical balance always even and just. First and foremost the book is an account of Bennett's career and achievement. Those elements in character and

environment which affected his creative work (his repressions, for example) are defined with precision. There is no attempt to appear profound, but as he passes by the critic notices everything that is good. He is looking always for the virtue, and throughout lays emphasis upon the 'honest' quality in the novels, the honest realism, the honest style and the honest workmanship. He is particularly good in his analysis of Bennett's craft and technique, equally in *The Pretty Lady* as in *The Old Wives' Tale*. Briefly, but very neatly, he considers the effect of journalism on Bennett's art—which he suggests may have made him create a false interest where dullness is the higher truth; but he does not fail to show also the contribution of Bennett to characterization in the English novel by introducing emotional discontinuity as a feature in his psychological portraits. The study is well-informed, unforced and sane. It is completed by a bibliography, and an appendix in which the sources of *The Old Wives' Tale* are examined.

W. D. THOMAS.

SWANSEA.

Mr André Classe's study, *The Rhythm of English Prose* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1939. 138 pp. 10s. 6d.), is by no means as comprehensive as its title might suggest. It is an essay in experimental phonetics, based in the main on kymograph recordings of short snatches of speech lasting for not more than a few seconds and lacking, as far as possible, emotional colouring. 'This form of speech alone is really suitable for the purpose of recording.' As a further restriction, both 'anacrusis' and the tail of the sentence—the final stress and all that follows it—are disregarded.

Within his limited field (and it must be said that he fully realizes its limitations) Mr Classe is a painstaking, cautious investigator who argues his case closely and lucidly. His inquiry into the exact position of the stress-point in different phonetic settings (the substance of the first chapter) yields new and interesting conclusions; it may be doubted, however, whether such microscopic analysis will be of great value to the student of prose rhythm in the larger sense, the appeal of which is to the ear not to the kymograph. His other two chapters ('The Distribution of Accents' and 'Quantity and Rhythmic Patterns') contain useful matter on the conditions militating against recurrence of isochronous intervals; but, as Mr Classe himself points out, they ignore, very largely, the relation between form and content and so are necessarily incomplete.

I have noticed slips or misprints in Fig. 1 and on pp. 11, 46, 63, 64, 66, 72, 75, 103, 108 and 132. The bibliography is of very little value.

FITZROY PYLE.

DUBLIN.

La Novela en la América Hispana, by Arturo Torres-Rioseco (*Univ. of California Publ. in Modern Philology*, xxi, no. 2, pp. 159–256, 1939), is announced as preliminary to a volume of detailed studies of *Grandes Novelistas de América* and yet another *Antología Hispano-Americana*. The major names in the story receive in consequence only the most casual

attention in the present work, which becomes to that extent a chronicle of the second rate. The main trends of post-colonial development stand out clearly none the less, a period when inspiration was political, typified in the novels centring on the tyrant Rosas, a second in which the regionalism and realism of Spain fought a losing battle against naturalism à la Zola, and a third, still vigorous, of predominantly native concern and technique, in which the novel, rural in setting, alternately exalts the qualities and deplors the fate of *indiano*, *negro*, *cholo*, *zambo*, *guajiro*, *huaso* or *mulato*. It would seem that in the *novela criolla*, as earlier in *modernismo*, the continent is still one. The attempt to cover a continent and a century in less than a hundred pages leaves the author little room for the broader issues of criticism, aesthetic or philosophical. Consideration of these is promised for the second volume.

WILLIAM C. ATKINSON.

GLASGOW.

Students of German are already indebted to Professor L. L. Hammerich for his concise account of German Phonology (reviewed in *M.L.R.* xxxii, p. 339). Now a pupil of his, Hr. Ole Restrup, opens the new Danish series *Studier i tysk filologi* with a study of Heinrich von Morungen (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard. 1938. 108 pp. Kr. 4.0). Here the student will find a detailed account of all the documentary evidence concerning the poet, the manuscripts and printed versions of his poems, and—most important of all—a critical evaluation of the research which has been published on their authenticity. Restrup shows admirable balance in his critical attitude; he demonstrates the futility of setting up a theory and then trying to force the facts to fit it, and with Neckel he argues that the only sound procedure is to build on the material supplied by the manuscripts. In the section on metre and rhythm he approves of Kraus's estimate of the poet's musical qualities, but regrets his tendency to touch up and rewrite the text 'aus rhythmischen Gründen'. Slight irregularities of metre, he points out, are not necessarily due to faulty MS. readings; they may quite well come direct from the poet. Further chapters are devoted to the content of the poems, the poet's models and influence on others, and finally, references to Heinrich von Morungen in the works of later writers. An appendix contains a selection of the poems in a Modern Danish translation made by Fru Inger Bach. The scholarly nature of this study augurs well for the success of the series, and we shall look with interest for further numbers.

R. J. McCLEAN.

LONDON.

English students of German can no longer complain of any lack of expert guidance. This anthology by R. Hinton Thomas (*The Classical Ideal in German Literature, 1755-1805. An Introduction and an Anthology*. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes. 1939. viii+126 pp. 5s.) provides just that information which the young specialist requires concerning the forces, humanism, baroque, rationalism, hellenism, which went to the

making of that greatest achievement of the German mind, the Classical Period of German Literature. Perhaps Mr Thomas underrates the contribution of pietism when he devotes but one meagre paragraph to Klopstock; he would answer, no doubt, that the *Messias* scarcely comes within his period, and that religion attained the acme of its inspiration in the music of J. S. Bach.

The selections are admirably chosen and provide a most striking profession of faith in those eternal verities which must always form the basis of true culture. The ethics, poetics, and especially the aesthetics of classicism are presented in their authors' own words and are knit together by suggestive introductions and apposite footnotes which bear testimony to the editor's judgment and scholarship.¹ More might perhaps have been made of foreign influences and of the gradual approximation of Goethe's and Schiller's theories to the pseudo-classicism of the Grand Siècle. The Bibliography would have gained by a reference to Walzel's pioneer work on Shaftesbury and 'der Prometheusgedanke', and Berger's *Schiller* has now been superseded by the recent volumes of Buchwald.

Whether the transcendental world of 'der schöne Schein' into which the Classicists sought to transport their readers was ever more than the dream of a cultured *élite* is very doubtful, in spite of the claim of a modern scholar that 'between 1830 and 1914 German Classicism was a substitute for religion'.² To judge from the present negation of all the humanitarian ideals for which it stood, its hold on the German people can never have been very secure. Was it because, unlike Romanticism, it looked back to a vanished world of the past rather than to a third Reich of the future?

L. A. WILLOUGHBY.

LONDON.

In *The German Novel of Today. A Guide to Contemporary Fiction in Germany, to the novels of the emigrants and to those of German-speaking Swiss writers* (Cambridge. Bowes and Bowes. 1939. 46 pp 2s.) a Swiss student of German literature, Dr A. W. Bettex, Lecturer in German at Cambridge, deals with 'the value of the two fragments into which German letters were split by the National Socialist revolution—the value of the literature of the German Reich and that of the emigrants'. He considers that both parties exaggerate, the one in maintaining that 'since 1933 no literature of any value has been produced in Germany, that it cannot possibly exist under the oppression of the state', and the other that 'apart from a few negligible exceptions the really valuable literature which is not at the same time in opposition to the State remains in the country, and that only those who wrongly called themselves

¹ Dach's authorship of *Annchen von Tharau* is, however, more than doubtful. Cf. W. Ziesemer in 'Altpreussische Forschungen', 1924.

² E. Kohn-Bramstedt, *Aristocracy and the Middle-Classes in Germany*, London, 1937, p. 278.

Germans have fled abroad'. It is obvious that the latter view is the one that gets the better press, for whatever propaganda may be made for the other side, the whole of the vast Nazi literary machinery, of which the author gives a brief description, is engaged in promulgating the orthodox creed in Germany.

The writer, however, gives a warning against the error of confusing the literature with the machinery, and maintains that there is in Germany 'a very great deal of tension between the spirit in which this machinery was set up and the spirit of a large section of the literary world'. Yet, while it is undoubtedly a fact that there is not the dead uniformity in the German literature of the Reich to-day that is frequently assumed, what has to be reckoned with above all is that view of literature on which the rising generation is being officially nurtured.

Dr Bettex gives a brief survey of the various groups of writers in Germany to-day, National Socialists, Catholics and Protestants, Individualists, Neo-Romantics and Neo-Classics, Nationalist Writers, ending with the Novel of the Emigrants and Austria and Switzerland. In the Conclusion he expresses the belief that between the dogmatisms of the left and right there is a central region, 'that the best of the writers in the Reich are intellectually not very far from the best of the emigrants', and that 'these writers belong to a "Third Front" which stretches throughout Europe and in which most of the literature of German-speaking Switzerland must also be included'. This is a very nice thought, but when we read in this connexion that for a Kolbenheyer and a Thomas Mann, for instance, for one of the major prophets of National Socialism and one of its scapegoats in the wilderness, 'a common cultural life is possible despite all individual divergencies' we wonder how much precisely it all means.

H. G. ATKINS.

LONDON.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

September—December 1939

With the collaboration of W. G. MOORE (French),
PAMELA GRADON (ENGLISH)

GENERAL

- ANDROVIC, G., *Dizionario italiano-croato*. Zara, Schonfeld. L. 95.
CHADWICK, H. M. and N. K., *The Growth of Literature*, iii. Cambridge Univ. Press. 35s.
COOPER, L., *Aristotelian Papers*, Revised and Reprinted. Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 14s. 6d.
DELLA VENERIA, C., *L' Inquisizione Medioevale*. Turin, Bocca. L. 15.
KONRAD, HEDWIG, *Étude sur la métaphore*. Paris, Vrin. 30 fr.
KOPPELMANN, H. L., *Ursachen des Lautwandels*. Leiden, Sijthoff. Fl. 4.50.
LOSCHI, MARIA, *Scrittrici d' Ungheria*. Turin, Pozzo. L. 15.
ONATSKY, E., *Grammatica ucraina teorico-pratica*. Naples, R. Istituto Superiore Orientale. L. 35.
PAGANO, A., *Manualetto della storia della letteratura medioevale*. Naples, Genovese. L. 10.
ROSTAGNI, A., *Classicità e spirito moderno*. Turin, Einaudi. L. 12.
TRY, O., *La Musica Bizantina*. Turin, Bocca. L. 36.
TOYNBEE, A. J., *A Study of History*. Oxford Univ. Press. 122s. 6d.
Ungheria d' oggi. Rome, Edizioni Roma. L. 10.
VAN LANGENHOVE, G., *Linguistische Studien*, Vol. II. Antwerp, De Sikkel.
VOLPE, G., *Il Medioevo*. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 25.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Mediaeval Latin.

- ALIPERTI, E., *I Poemi di Virgilio in un centone del secolo XVI di P. A. Spera: La Passione di Cristo cantata con i versi di Virgilio*. Naples, Studio di Propaganda Editoriale. L. 50.
AUGUSTINE, St., *Città di Dio*, text ed. and trsl. C. Costa, libri I-V (Corona Patrum Salesiana) Turin, SEI. L. 35.
FINAERT, J., *L'Évolution littéraire de saint Augustin; Saint Augustin rhéteur*, 2 vols. Paris, Belles Lettres. 70 fr.
QUADRI, G., *Autortà e libertà nella filosofia di Giovanni Duns Scoto*. Naples, Studio di Propaganda Editoriale. L. 7.
RENAUDET, A., *Études Erasmiennes (1521-29)*. Paris, Droz.
SPINOZA, B., *Etica*, ed. E. Paci. Milan, Mondadori. L. 5.

Italian.

- ALESSIO, G., *Saggio di toponomastica calabrese*. Florence, Olschki. L. 160.
APOLLONJ, E., *Guida alle Biblioteche italiane*. Milan, Mondadori. L. 14.
APOSTOLITI, P., *Sintesi della letteratura italiana contemporanea*. Milan, Quaderni di Poesia. L. 6.

- ARCARI, P., Manzoni. Milan, Colonello. L. 12.
- BARDUZZI, C., Bibliografia ebraica e giudaica in lingua italiana. Rome, Cremonese. L. 10.
- BENINI, R., Scienza, religione ed arte nell'astronomia di Dante. Rome, Accademia d' Italia. L. 15
- BERR, H., Machiavel et l'Allemagne. Paris, Michel. 2 fr. 50.
- BOCCACCIO, Il Decamerone. Florence, Sansoni. L. 32.
- BOCCACCIO, G., Il Decamerone, i. Milan, Sonzogno. L. 4.
- BOCCACCIO, G., L' Elogio di Madonna Fiammetta, ed. V. Pernicone. Bari, Laterza. L. 25.
- BONTEMPELLI, M., L' Avventura novecentista. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 20.
- CAPASSO, A., Commento al Rinaldo di T. Tasso. Rome, Albrighi e Segati. L. 15.
- CARDUCCI, G., Lettere, III: 1862-3. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 25.
- CAVAZZUTI, G., Ludovico Antonio Muratori. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- CIAN, V., La Satira. dal Medioevo al Pontano. Milan, Vallardi. L. 65.
- CINTI, D., Dizionario degli scrittori italiani. Milan, Sonzogno. L. 6.
- COSTANZI, O., Il Pensiero religioso di Vittorio Alfieri. Rome, Ausonia. L. 8.
- CREMONA COZZOLINI, I., Maria Mazzini e il suo ultimo carteggio, con 79 lettere di Giuseppe Mazzini. Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 25.
- CROCE, B., Scritti di storia letteraria e politica: conversazioni critiche, v. Bari, Laterza. L. 30.
- DAMERINI, G., Settecento veneziano. Milan, Mondadori. L. 20.
- D' Annunzio e la musica. Milan, Bocca. L. 20.
- DANTE, La Divina Commedia, ed. E. Fabietti. Milan, Barion. L. 4.
- DAZZI, M., Leopardi e il romanzo. Milan, Bocca. L. 14.
- DE BLASI, I., Gabriele D' Annunzio. Florence, Sansoni. L. 20.
- DE RITIS, A., Dante intimo nella storia, nella leggenda e nell arte. Milan, Arti Grafiche. L. 10.
- DE SANCTIS, F., Storia della letteratura italiana, i. Milan, Sonzogno. L. 4.
- DONADONI, E., Antonio Fogazzaro. Bari, Laterza. L. 18.
- ERMINT, A., Note leopardiane. Rome, Ausonia. L. 5.
- FARINELLI, A., Leonardo e la Natura. Milan, Bocca. L. 10.
- FERRERO, C. G., Prose illustre dell' Ottocento (Giordano, Botta, Colletta). Turin, Paravia. L. 7.
- FIORENTINO, F., La Filosofia della Rinascenza. Milan, Signorelli. L. 6.
- FOSCOLO, U., I Sepolcri, comm. I. Testa. Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 3.50.
- FOSCOLO, U., Opere: Prose letterarie, 1. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 8.
- FRANCESCO, St., I Fioretti. Milan, Sonzogno. L. 4.
- FRATICELLI, V. L., Gabriele D' Annunzio. Milan, Zucchi. L. 4.
- GALLETTI, A., Il Novecento. Milan, Vallardi. L. 80.
- GASPARRINI LEPORACE, T., Guida storica e bibliografica degli archivi e delle biblioteche d' Italia, v. Rome, Libreria dello Stato. L. 20.
- GATTI, A., Gabriele D' Annunzio. Rome, R. Accademia d' Italia. L. 5.
- GENTILE, G., Poesia e filosofia di G. Leopardi. Florence, Sansoni. L. 8.
- GIANNANTONI, M., Gabriele D' Annunzio. Milan. L. 20.
- GILSON, E., Dante et la philosophie. Paris, Vrin. 50 fr.
- GINORI CONTI, Principe P., Bibhografia delle opere del Savonarola. Florence, Fondazione Ginori Conti. L. 100.
- GRASSO, I., Nuova critica leopardiana. Palermo, Agate. L. 20.

- GRECO, E., *Il Mondo degli Affari nel romanzo e nel teatro*. Rome, Bocca. L. 12.
- GUALTIERI, G. V., *Poesia e poeti da Dante ad Angelina Lanza*. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 12.
- GUSTARELLI, A., *Giovanni Verga*. Milan, Vallardi. L. 3.50.
- GUSTARELLI, A., *Leonardo da Vinci*. Milan, Vallardi. L. 4.
- GUSTARELLI, A., *Niccolò Tommaseo*. Milan, Vallardi. L. 3.50.
- LANTRUA, A., *G. B. Vico*. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- LEONETTI, P., *Storia della tecnica del verso italiano*, II 2. Naples, Morano. L. 7.
- LEOPARDI, G., *Canti*, ed. E. M. Fusco. Bologna, Cappelli. L. 10.
- LIPPARINI, G., *Convito: saggi e discorsi*. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 15.
- LISINI, A. e G. BIANCHI BANDINELLI, *La Pia dantesca*. Siena, Accademia di Arti e Lettere. L. 30.
- LORENZO DE' MEDICI, *Opere*, ed. A. Simioni. Bari, Laterza. L. 60.
- MAGNI, V., *L' Apostolo del Rinascimento (Savonarola)*. L. 10.
- MALAGOLI, L., *Guicciardini*. Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 16.
- MANZONI, A., *Adelchi*, ed. D. Magri. Milan, Principato. L. 5.
- (MANZONI). *Annali Manzoniiani*. Florence, Sansoni. L. 50.
- MANZONI, A., *Il Conte di Carmagnola*, ed. A. Piccagli. Turin, SEI. L. 6.
- MARPICATI, A., *Dante e il Foscolo*. Rome, Istituto Nazionale di Cultura Fascista. L. 4.
- MATTALIA, D., *Giosuè Carducci*. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- MERONE, E., *Leopardi vittima del suo genio*. Naples, Studio Popolare Editoriale. L. 3.
- MESSINI, A., *Profetismo e profezie ritmiche italiane d' ispirazione gioachimito-francescana, nei sec. XIII, XIV e XV*. Rome, Miscellanea Francescana. L. 6.
- MORRONE, G., *Parabola del Romanticismo*. Bari, Macri. L. 10.
- MUSSINI, C., *Alessandro Tassoni*. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- NARDI, P., *Poesia d' oggi: antologia critica*. Milan, Centauro. L. 25.
- ORESTANO, F., *Opere edite e inedite*. To be completed in 25 vols. 5 published for L. 110.
- PALMIERI, E. F., *Teatro italiano nel nostro tempo*. Bologna, Testa. L. 30.
- PANCRAZI, P., *Scrittori italiani del novecento*. Bari, Laterza. L. 20.
- PANCRAZI, P., *Studi sul D' Annunzio*. Rome, Einaudi. L. 12.
- PAPINI, G., *Felicità di Giacomo Leopardi*. Rome, R. Accademia d' Italia. L. 5.
- PETRARCA, Rime, i *Trionfi e le Opere latine*, ed. E. Ciampardini. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 11.
- PETRARCA, *Trionfi*. Rome, Ribostelli. L. 50.
- PETRONIO, G., *Francesco De Sanctis*. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- PREVITERA, C., *La Poesia gioiosa e l' umorismo: dalle origini al Rinascimento*. Milan, Vallardi. L. 60.
- RAVEGNANI, G., *Il Novecento letterario italiano, I*. Bologna, Testa. L. 35.
- RAYA, G., *Ottocento letterario: studi e ricerche*. Palermo, Cinni. L. 14.
- READE, W. H. V., *Dante's Vision of History (British Academy)*. Oxford Univ. Press. 2s.
- RENDA, U., *Giovanni Pontano, 1426-1503*. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- Rimatori del Dolce Stil Nuovo*, ed. L. Benedetto. Bari, Laterza. L. 25.
- RESTA, F., *Contemporaneità del pensiero di G. Leopardi*. Taranto, De Pace. L. 4.
- ROGGERO, E., *Leonardo*. Milan, Corticelli. L. 12.

- RUSSO, L., *Commedie fiorentine del '500*. Florence, Sansoni. L. 12.
- RUSSO, L., *Gli Scrittori d'Italia da Jacopo da Lentini a Pirandello*; i, Dal Gahlei al Manzoni; iii, Dal Leopardi al Pirandello. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 16 32.
- SANSONE, M., *Saggio sulla storiografia Manzoniiana*. Naples, Ricciardi. L. 8.
- SANTINI, E., *Vittorio Alfieri*. Palermo, Palumbo. L. 20.
- SCHAUB KOCH, Angiolo Silvio Novaro, trsl. P. Tosel. Pinerolo, Taio Petro. L. 10.
- SIMONI, R., *Alfredo Panzini*. Rome, R. Accademia d'Italia. L. 6.
- SOTGIU, *Introduzione ad una storia letteraria del nostro secolo*. Rome, Augustea. L. 6.
- SPALLICCI, M., *La Poesia dialettale romagnola*. Milan, L' Arola. L. 9.
- STOPPANI, P., *La Parlata di Meneghino*. Milan, Vallardi. L. 10.
- TOFFANIN, G., e G. SBORSELLI, *La Letteratura italiana*. Rome, Perrella. L. 18.
- TOGNACCI, E. F., *Ricordi pascoliani*, i. Rimini, Garattoni. L. 12.
- TOMBA, S., *Manuale per lo studio della lingua italiana*. Bologna, Cappelli. L. 10.
- TOMMASEO, N., *Diario intimo*, ed. Ciampini. Turin, Einaudi. L. 25.
- VIOLA, R., *Fogazzaro*. Florence, Sansoni. L. 15.
- VITALI, G., A. Aleardi, G. Zanella. Milan, Vallardi. L. 5.
- VITALI, G., *Francesco Guicciardini*. Milan, Vallardi. L. 5.50.

Spanish, Catalan, Basque.

- ALONSO CORTÉS, N., *El pronombre 'se' y la voz pasiva castellana*. Valladolid. América y Hostos. Habana, Cultural.
- ARRIETA, R. A., *Florencio Balcarce*. Buenos Aires, Suárez.
- AZUELA, M., *Los de abajo*, ed. J. E. Englekirk and L. B. Kiddle. New York, Crofts. \$1.40.
- CARRERA ANDRADE, J., *Guía de la joven poesía ecuatoriana*. Tokio, Ediciones Asia-América.
- COMETTA MANZON, AIDA, *El Indio en la poesía de América Española*. Buenos Aires, Torres.
- DAIREAUX, M., José Martí. Paris, Éditions France-Amérique.
- Estrella de Sevilla*, ed. F. O. Reed, Esther M. Dixon, and J. M. Hill. Boston, Heath.
- GONZÁLEZ DEL VALLE, F., *Cronología Herediana*. Habana, Secretaría de Educación.
- (HEREDIA.) *Antología Herediana*. Habana, Consejo de Educación.
- LARASQUET, J., *Le Basque de la Basse-Soule orientale*. Paris, Klincksieck. 100 fr.
- MADARIAGA, S. DE, *Christopher Columbus*. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 21s.
- PEERS, E. A., *A History of the Romantic Movement in Spain*, 2 vols. Cambridge Univ. Press. 50s.
- SÁNCHEZ, L. A., *La Literatura del Perú*. Buenos Aires, Universidad.
- WASMER, MARIE, *Huit mystiques espagnols*. Paris, Corrêa. 24 fr.
- ZALDUMBIDE, G., et M. DAIREAUX, *Montalvo*. Paris, Éditions France-Amérique.
- ZUM FELDE, A., *La Literatura del Uruguay*. Buenos Aires, Universidad.

Portuguese.

- ANSELMO, M., *A Poesia de Jorge de Lima*. São Paulo, autor.
- CARVALHO, A. L. DE, *Os Mesteres de Guimarães*, i. Barcelos. Lisbon, Instituto para a Alta Cultura.
- FIGUEIREDO, F. DE, *Aristarchos*. São Paulo, Dep. da Cultura.

FONSECA, Q. DA, Diários da Navegação da Carreira de Índia. Lisbon, Academia das Ciências.

Gil Vicente: vida y obras. Lisbon, Academia das Ciências.

LIRA, H., História de D. Pedro II. 2 vols. Rio de Janeiro.

MORENO, A., Lições de Linguagem, IV. Porto, Editora Educação Nacional.

OLIVEIRA, J. A. DE, O Cêrco de Lisboa em 1147. Lisbon.

OLIVEIRA, J. OSORIO DE, História breve da Literatura Brasileira. Lisbon.

SANTOS, R. DOS, A Tomada de Lisboa nas Iluminaturas Manuelinas. Lisbon.

French, Provençal.

(a) General (including Linguistic).

ALESSIO, L., L' Argot vocabolario. Turin, Petrini. L. 10.

CRUCHET, R., La Médecine et les médecins dans la littérature française. Paris, Delmas. 25 fr.

DORESTE, V., und F. STROHMEYER, Einführung in die französischen Sprache Leipzig, Teubner. 3 M. 40.

MARCHAND, L., Initiation à la littérature et à la science françaises. Paris, Larousse. 28 fr.

RAT, M., Le Participe. Paris, Garnier. 7 fr. 50.

RAT, M., Le Verbe. Paris, Garnier. 7 fr. 50.

WALGARTH-WALINSKI, J., Französisch (Meyers Weltsprachen). Berlin, Bibliographisches Institut. 15 M.

(b) Old French.

GILSON, E., et G. THERY, Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen-Age. Paris, Vrin. 75 fr.

Girart de Rossillon, ed. E. B. Ham. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 14s.

(c) Modern French.

BACHELARD, G., Lautréamont. Paris, Corti. 20 fr.

BAUDELAIRE, CH., Œuvres complètes, 1: Juvenilia, œuvres posthumes, reliquiae, ed. J. Crépet. Paris, Conard. 75 fr.

CAHUET, A., Irène, femme inconnue. London, Nelson. 2s.

CHARDONNE, J., Claire. London, Nelson. 2s.

CHÉNIER, A., Œuvres complètes. Paris, NRF. 105 fr.

CLEMENT, N. H., Romanticism in France (Revolving Fund Series, ix). Oxford Univ. Press. 14s.

CONTARDI, E., Gerberto D'Aurillac (Silvestro II), meraviglia del suo secolo. Rome, Alba. L. 5.

(DESCARTES.) Estudios en honor de Descartes. Univ. de La Plata.

FERRE, A., Géographie de Marcel Proust. Paris, Sagittaire. 24 fr.

FLETCHER, F. T. H., Montesquieu and English Politics. London, Arnold. 12s. 6d.

FROMENTIN, Les Maîtres d'autrefois. Paris, Garnier. 18 M. 50.

GUÉROULT, Étendue et psychologie chez Malebranche. Paris, Belles Lettres. 20 fr.

LA FONTAINE, Fables. Paris, Garnier. 18 fr.

LAUTRÉAMONT, Les Chants de Maldoror. Paris, Corti. 20 fr.

LIOW KIN-LING, Étude sur l'art de Victor Hugo dans 'La fin de Satan'. Paris, Nizet et Bastard. 20 fr.

McKEE, K. N., The Rôle of the Priest on the Parisian Stage during the French Revolution. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$1.25.

- MAINE DE BIRAN, XI. Paris, Presses Universitaires. 80 fr.
 Manuel de la littérature catholique en France de 1870 à nos jours. Paris, Spes. 25 fr.
 MONDOR, H., *L'Amitié de Verlaine et de Mallarmé*. Paris, NRF. 65 fr.
 MORTON, J. B., *Saint-Just*. London, Longmans. 15s. 6d.
 PURE, M. DE, *La Prétieuse*, ed. E. Magne. Paris, Droz. 30 fr.
 RABELAIS, F., *Pantagruel*, ed. P. Grimal. Paris, Cluny. 15 fr.
 RONSARD, P., *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Laumonier, ix (STFM). Paris, Droz. 40 fr.
 SMITH, C. B., *France, 1815-71*. London, Arnold. 4s
 STEEGMULLER, *Flaubert et Madame Bovary*. London, Hale. 12s. 6d.
 STENDHAL, *Le Rouge et le Noir*. Paris, Garnier. 15 fr.
 STEVENS, L. T., *La Langue de Brantôme*. Paris, Nizet et Bastard. 30 fr.
 THUASNE, L., *Œuvres de Fr. Villon*. Paris, Picard. 18 fr
 TODD, R., *The Laughing Mulatto: the story of Alexandre Dumas*. London, Rich and Cowan. 12s. 6d.
 VERLAINE, P., *Poèmes saturniennes*. Paris, Cluny. 15 fr.
 VERLAINE, P., *Proses choisies*. Paris, Messein. 15 fr.
 VERLAINE, P., *Sagesse; Liturgies intimes*. Paris, Cluny. 15 fr.
 VEICE, J. V., *Gabriel Naudé*. Johns Hopkins and Paris, Belles Lettres. 40 fr.

(d) *Provençal*.

- UGOLINI, F. A., *La Poesia provenzale e Italia*. Modena, Soc. Tip. Modenese. L. 15.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

- FRIEDRICHSEN, G. W. S., *The Gothic Version of the Epistles*. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 25s.
 Old West Frisian Skeltana Riucht, The, ed. and trans. by S. Fairbanks. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s. 6d.
 WOOLF, H. B., *The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving*. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses.

English.

(a) *General (including linguistic)*.

- BØGHOLM, N., *English Speech from an Historical Point of View*. Copenhagen, Nyt Nordisk Forlag; London, Allen and Unwin. 18s.
 Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Literature, The. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6s.
 DOUGLAS, D. C., *English Scholars*. London, Cape. 15s.
 ELIOT, T. S., *The Idea of a Christian Society*. London, Faber. 5s.
 MOWAT, R. B., *The Victorian Age*. London, Harrap. 7s. 6d.
 Proceedings of the British Academy, 1938. London, H. Milford, for the British Academy. 30s.
 WHITEHALL, H., *Middle English \bar{u} and Related Sounds: Their Development in Early American English*. Baltimore, Md., Linguistic Soc. of America.

(b) *Old and Middle English*.

- ARNULF OF LISIEUX, *The Letters of*, ed. by F. Barlow (Camden Third Series, vol. LXXI, Royal Historical Society).
 HOTCHNER, C. A., *Wessex and Old English Poetry, with special consideration of 'The Ruin'*. New York, the Author (903, Lincoln Place).

- HOUSTON, M. G., *Medieval Costume in England and France*. London, Black. 12s. 6d.
- Norfolk Portion of the Chartulary of the Priory of S. Pancras of Lewes, The, ed. by J. H. Bullock. Norfolk Record Society.
- Three Middle English Sermons from the Worcester Chapel Manuscript F. 10, ed. by D. M. Grisdale. Univ. of Leeds, School of English Language. 7s. 6d.
- WRIGHT, C. E., *The Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England*. Edinburgh and London, Oliver and Boyd. 15s.

(c) *Modern English*.

- ARNOLD, M., *Poetry and Prose*, ed. by Sir E. K. Chambers. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d.
- AUSTEN, J., *The Story of Don Juan*. London, Secker. 12s. 6d.
- BAKER, E. A., *The History of the English Novel*. Vol. 10: Yesterday. London, Witherby. 16s.
- BANKS, J., *The Unhappy Favourite or the Earl of Essex*, ed. by T. M. H. Blair. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 17s. 6d.
- BARKER, R. H., *Mr Cibber of Drury Lane*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 19s.
- CHRISTIE, O. F., *Dickens and his Age*. London, Cranton. 10s. 6d.
- COLBOURNE, M., *The Real Bernard Shaw*. London, Dent. 8s. 6d.
- CONNELY, W., *The True Chesterfield*. London, Cassell. 15s.
- DEWES, S., Marian. *The Life of George Eliot*. London, Rich and Cowan. 15s.
- ELLIS-FERMOR, U., *The Irish Dramatic Movement*. London, Methuen. 10s. 6d.
- ELTON, O., *Lascelles Abercrombie, 1881-1938*. London, H. Milford (for the British Academy). 2s. 6d.
- EVES, C. K., *Matthew Prior, Poet and Diplomatist*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 25s.
- HARRISON, T. P. (ed.), *The Pastoral Elegy*, transl. by H. J. Leon. Austin University of Texas. \$2.50.
- HOUSMAN, A. E., *The Collected Poems*. London, Cape. 7s. 6d.
- MARLOWE, C., *Plays (World's Classics)*. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 2s.
- MAXWELL, B., *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger*. Chapel Hill, Univ. of N. Carolina Press. \$3 00.
- MOORE, J., *The Life and Letters of Edward Thomas*. London, Heinemann. 15s.
- Oxford Book of English Verse, The. New ed. by Sir A. Quiller-Couch. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d.
- RENDALL, G. H., *Ben Jonson and the First Folio Edition of Shakespeare's Plays*. Colchester, Benham. 1s.
- SCOTT, W., *The Journal of*, revised by J. G. Tait from a photostat in the National Library of Scotland. London, Oliver and Boyd. 5s.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., *King Lear (Pied Bull Quarto, 1608)*; *The Merchant of Venice (Hayes Quarto, 1600)*; *The Merry Wives of Windsor (1602 Quarto)* (*Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, 1-3*). London, Shakespeare Assoc. and Sidgwick and Jackson. 10s. 6d. each.
- WARREN, A., *Richard Crashaw*. University, La., Louisiana State Univ. Press. \$3.00.
- WEST, R. H., *The Invisible World. A Study in Pneumatology in Elizabethan Drama*. Athens, Univ. of Georgia Press.
- WEYGANDT, H. M., *Kipling's Reading and its Influence on his Poetry*. Pennsylvania Univ. Press. \$2.

WHITING, G. W., *Milton's Literary Milieu*. Chapel Hill, Univ. of N. Carolina Press. \$3.50.

YOUNG, L. M., *Thomas Carlyle and the Art of History*. Pennsylvania Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 11s. 6d.

German.

(*Owing to war conditions it has been found impossible to compile our usual list of new publications in the field of German language and literature. We give below a list of publications in this field received by us for review in the period from July to December 1939. Editor.*)

(a) General (including Linguistic).

Cassell's German Dictionary, rev. and enlarged by J. H. Lepper and R. Kottenhahn. London, Cassell. 12s. 6d.; English-German only, 7s. 6d.

PALMER, P. M., *Neuweltwörter im Deutschen* (Germ. Bibl. II. 42). Heidelberg, Winter. 9 M. 60.

ROOTH, E., *Vrasmunt Ein Beitrag zur mittelhochdeutschen Wortgeschichte* (Lunder germ. Forsch., 9). Lund, Gleerup; Copenhagen, Munksgaard. Kr. 3.50.

(b) Old and Middle High German.

HARTMANN VON AUE, Erec. ed. by A. Leitzmann (Altd. Textbibl., 39). Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

(c) Modern German.

BETTEX, A. W., *The German Novel of Today*. Cambridge, Bowes and Bowes. 2s.

BITHELL, J., *Modern German Literature, 1880-1938*. London, Methuen. 18s.

FISCHER, W., *Des Darmstadter Schriftstellers Johann Heinrich Kunze (1810-1873) Beziehungen zu England*. (Giessener Beitr. z. d. Phil., 67.) Giessen, Otto Kmdt. 4 M.

KLETT, A. M., *Der Streit um 'Faust II' seit 1900* (Jenaer Germ. Forsch. 33). Jena, W. Biedermann. 6 M. 80.

MCEACHRAN, F., *The Life and Philosophy of Johann Gottfried Herder* (Oxford Stud. in Mod. Lang. and Lit.). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.

MILLER, R. D., *The Meaning of Goethe's 'Faust'*. Cambridge, Heffer. 6s.

NEEDLER, G. H., *Letters of Anna Jameson to Ottilie von Goethe*. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 15s.

PUSEY, W. W., *Louis-Sébastien Mercier in Germany* (Columbia Univ. Germ. Stud., 8). Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s. 6d.

ROSENHAUPT, H. W., *Der deutsche Dichter um die Jahrhundertwende und seine Abgelöstheit von der Gesellschaft* (Sprache u. Dichtung, 66). Bern-Leipzig, Paul Haupt. Sw. Fr. 9.

THOMAS, R. H., *The Classical Ideal in German Literature, 1755-1805*. Cambridge, Bowes and Bowes. 5s.

WIELAND, C. M., *Oberon*, transl by J. Q. Adams, ed. by A. B. Faust. New York, F. S. Crofts. \$3.

MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1939

(Incorporating the American Transactions for the Period to 7 September 1939)

| Dr. 1938 | EXPENDITURE | | | INCOME | | | Cr |
|-------------|---|---------|----------|---|----------|----------|-----------|
| | £ | £ s. d. | £ s. d. | £ | £ s. d. | £ s. d. | |
| 25 | To Printing, Stationery, Postages and Travelling Expenses, etc. ... | 32 17 5 | | By Subscriptions General ... | 113 7 0 | | |
| 8 | Do. (American Expenses) ... | 11 10 0 | 44 7 5 | Proportion of Life Membership subscriptions ... | 3 12 4 | | |
| 74 | " Secretarial Assistance and Audit Fee | 68 13 6 | | American Members ... | 77 16 8 | | |
| 4 | Do. (American Expenses) . | 1 2 6 | 69 16 0 | " Bibliography Sales ... | | 143 17 8 | 194 16 0 |
| 202 | " Bibliography Printing ... | | 244 13 9 | Advertisements ... | | 5 0 0 | |
| | " Year's Work in Modern Language Studies | | | American Sales .. | | 47 0 3 | |
| 200 | Printing ... | | 142 18 3 | " Year's Work in Modern Language Studies | | | 195 17 11 |
| 22 | Bulletins and Indexes | | | Sales . | 101 1 10 | | |
| | Printing .. | | 40 3 4 | Advertisements . | 5 0 0 | | |
| - | Surplus for year carried to Balance Sheet. | | 5 6 3 | American Sales . | 14 19 11 | | 121 1 9 |
| | | | | " Bulletins and Indexes | | | |
| | | | | Sales ... | | 4 4 1 | |
| | | | | Interest on Bank Deposit .. | | 6 8 3 | |
| | | | | " Work in Progress American advertisement ... | | 4 12 0 | |
| | | | | " Modern Language Review | | | |
| | | | | Surplus, per Account attached | | 20 5 0 | |
| | | | | " Deficit for year | | | |
| | | | £547 5 0 | | | | £547 5 0 |

BALANCE SHEET 30 SEPTEMBER 1939

AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE AND REPORT

(Signed) R. THOMPSON HALL,
Incorporated Accountant

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE
27 November 1939.

ELIZABETHAN-RESTORATION PALIMPSEST

My hypothesis may be briefly stated: Certain playwrights after 1660 secured, in manuscript, unprinted plays written before 1642, modernized them, and had them produced and published as their own; hence a number of Restoration plays hitherto considered original are actually adaptations of 'lost' Elizabethan plays.¹ Some of the authors involved, both pilfered and pilferers, are men of mark in literary history, and to the shades of the latter I must offer a word of propitiation. Although my terms and methods may suggest the pursuit of criminals, I am making no charges of moral obliquity. To appropriate silently the work of earlier dramatists was in former times a normal practice: Shakespeare himself had made himself beautiful with others' feathers.

1. PRESUMPTION OF GUILT

Known practices of the Restoration supply us with a kind of *a priori* case. Restoration drama is extremely derivative. Between 1660 and 1700, five hundred and thirty-eight 'new' plays were produced or written with production in mind. Of these, forty-four were translations or adaptations of foreign plays, sixty were adaptations of older English plays.² Among the adapters were Davenant, Dryden, Sedley, Tuke, Digby, Villiers, Rochester, Shadwell, Betterton, Behn, Settle, Otway, Ravenscroft, D'Urfey, Crown, Tate, and Vanbrugh. Those adapted were chiefly Corneille and Molière among the foreign playwrights, Shakespeare and Fletcher among the native, but the list of the latter includes also Webster, Massinger, Hemming, Brome, Middleton, Brewer, Marston, Marmion, William Rowley, Chapman, Shirley, and even Marlowe and Jonson.

One hundred and six plays, then, 19.3 % of the total, are demonstrably unoriginal, that is, nearly one play in five. Excluded from the count, so far as I have been able to exclude them,³ are the scores of additional

¹ I am here developing a suggestion I first made in a paper read at the meeting of the Modern Language Association of America in December, 1936. I have gained access to materials with the aid of a grant from the Faculty Research Committee of the University of Pennsylvania.

² The count is based upon my analytical play-list, *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700*, now at press.

³ The word 'adaptation' has been loosely used in dramatic criticism, and in the case of some plays which I have not read I may have been misled. Excluded from my count also are the 'drolls' derived from pre-Commonwealth drama (without acknowledgement), and scholarly translations from classical drama such as those by Echard, Sherburne, etc. (not intended for the stage).

plays which lean upon precursors for characters, plots, and occasional details. The one hundred and six are sufficiently close to their originals to have made, even according to the easy going standards of the day, some kind of acknowledgement appropriate—or so we should suppose.

By no means, however, was the acknowledgement generally forthcoming. In some cases the conscience of adapter or printer, or both, proved robust beyond belief. Titles were altered and readers were supplied no hint of the existence of original versions. In 1661 James Shirley's *Constant Maid*, first issued in 1640, was reissued as *Love will find out the Way* by 'T. B.'—this while the original author was still alive! An adaptation of Shirley's *The Traitor* was printed in 1692. The original title was retained, but the dedicatee, the Earl of Clancarty, Baron Blarney, was informed that for this play, 'one of the best Tragedies that this Age hath Produced. . . it is Commendation enough to say the Author was Mr Rivers'. Even such close translations as William Lower's *Amorous Fantasm*,¹ 1660, and Davenant's *The Man's the Master*,² 1669, were published without hint of their true nature. There was point to John Caryl's Epilogue to *Sir Salomon, or The Cautious Coxcomb*,³ 1671.

What we have brought before you, was not meant
For a new Play, but a new President;
For we with Modesty our Theft avow,
(There is some Conscience shewn in stealing too)
And openly declare, that if our Cheer
Does hit your Pallats, you must thank Molliere:

An examination of the title-pages, prefatory material, prologues and epilogues of most of the translations and adaptations of the period enables me to make certain generalizations. We must notice, first of all, that the publishers were quite ruthless: rare, indeed, was the title-page that signalled to the purchaser that the play was second-hand. The playwrights were also ruthless, but somewhat more careful. Renderings from Pierre Corneille (though not from Thomas) were usually admitted, and also, as his reputation grew, were those from Molière. Adaptations of Shakespeare and Fletcher usually confess themselves to be such, sometimes naming the original author, sometimes assuming him to be known. Frequently, however, the admission is quite inconspicuous, and the debt is minimized. For his *Fool's Preferment*,⁴ 1688, D'Urfey confesses only to a 'hint' from Fletcher; and for *The Unhappy Kindness*,⁵

¹ Quinault's *Le Fantôme Amoureux*.

² Scarron's *Jodelet, ou le Maître Valet*. Both *The Man's the Master* and *The Rivals* (unacknowledged adaptation of *Two Noble Kinsmen*) were published after Davenant's death, so that his responsibility is limited.

³ Adaptation of *L'Ecole des Femmes*, etc., acted 1669-70.

⁴ Adapted from *The Noble Gentleman*. ⁵ Adapted from Fletcher's *Wife for a Month*.

1697, Scott to 'little...but the Design'. Never is the original play a subject to be dwelt upon.

Corneille, Molière, Shakespeare, and Fletcher were so well known that wholesale appropriation was simply impracticable. With the lesser-known writers the case was otherwise. We have already noticed that James Shirley's plays seemed 'safe'. Other instances are provided by Davenant's *The Rivals*, 1668 (*Two Noble Kinsmen*); Behn's (?) *The Debauchee*, 1677 (Brome's *Mad Couple Well Matched*); Behn's (?) *The Counterfeit Bridegroom*, 1677 (Middleton's *No Wit No Help like a Woman's*); Leanerd's *The Country Innocence*, 1677 (Brewer's *Country Girl*); Leanerd's *Rambling Justice*, 1678 (Middleton's *More Dissemblers besides Women*); Tate's *A Duke and No Duke*, 1685 (Cokain's *Trappolin Supposed a Prince*); Anonymous, *The Rampant Alderman*, 1685 (Marmion's *Fine Companion*); Harris's *The City Bride*, 1696 (Webster's *Cure for a Cuckold*). These are all adaptations parading as original plays. The list is merely illustrative, and is limited to plays with English originals in print.

Unless the older play is famous, mention of indebtedness is so rare as to seem gratuitous. D'Urfey's dedication of his version of *Bussy D'Ambois*, 1691, contains a patronizing allusion to Chapman; and Settle's *Love and Revenge*,¹ 1675, curiously indeed, pays proper tribute to Hemming's *Fatal Contract*. Shadwell is one of the more frank adapters of the period, but whether he deserves credit for describing *The Royal Shepherdess*, 1669, as an adaptation of Fountain's *Rewards of Virtue* depends somewhat upon whether Fountain was still alive. An amusing instance of enforced candour is provided by Aphra Behn's *The Rover*, Part I, 1677: the 'Postscript' reads in part:

This play had been sooner in Print, but for a Report about the Town (made by some either very Maltitious or very Ignorant) that 'twas *Thomaso* alter'd; which made the Book-sellers fear some trouble from the Proprietor of that Admirable Play, which indeed has Wit enough to stock a Poet....

Amidst additional sweet words for Killigrew, author of *Thomaso*, Mrs Behn remarks that she has 'stol'n some hints'. And indeed she has! The playwrights sometimes resort to simple ambiguity: Tate's Epilogue to *Injured Love*, 1707, reads in part:

One could with less Expençe i'th' Modern Way,
Have fitted out a slight New-fashioned Play
To Leak, and Bulge, and Founder in the Bay;
But chose a Vessel that would bear the shock
Of censure; yes, old Built, but Heart of Oak.

¹ Acted 1674. Settle takes for granted that Guarini will be known as original author of *Pastor Fido*, adapted by him in 1677, but he is misleading on the subject of *Herod and Maramne*, which he published in 1674 with the comment that the play (Corneille's) 'was given him by a gentleman'. The mysterious 'gentleman' who gives away plays will be encountered again.

These lines would pacify the knowledgeable, given to browsing in old quartos, but would scarcely inform the average citizen that *Injured Love* is an adaptation of Webster's *The White Devil*.

At the moment my case stands as follows: Restoration playwrights frequently *did* adapt pre-Restoration plays, and, when it seemed safe to do so, adapted them surreptitiously. Existence of the parent play was mentioned reluctantly or not at all. Yet the parent plays thus far mentioned were all in print. Had they come to the adapters in manuscript, we might predicate a uniform and penetrating silence. And what about plays in manuscript? The adapters would not have confined themselves to printed plays were others available. Unprinted plays would have served just as well those who were writing for money, and would have served much better those who were writing for fame.

2. OPPORTUNITY

I have been discussing Motive: what follows is *de rigueur*. Granted that Restoration writers were willing to utilize plays in manuscript, would they have been able to do so? The answer is unequivocal. Scores of manuscripts were available. Between 1558 and 1642, so many plays were left unprinted that our lists, even though incomplete, record the titles of hundreds. That the manuscripts of many of the unprinted plays survived to the Restoration is indicated by the number that have survived to the present day.¹ But such an approach is impressionistic, and our immediate problem is a practical one. The present phase of my discussion I shall limit to *known* manuscripts—now lost but *not lost in* 1660, and distinguished then by their concentration in collections of noticeable size and by their probable accessibility to the new playwrights.

On 29 December 1653, the bookseller Richard Marriott entered in the Stationers' Register the titles of twenty-one plays. The names of the authors were not given, but, judging by the modish titles, most of the plays belonged to the decade before 1642. Only two of Marriott's plays were published, the manuscripts of the rest presumably remaining in the shop where he conducted his business well into the Restoration period. That booksellers kept play manuscripts in stock is proved by Francis Kirkman's note to his catalogue of plays appended to *All Mistaken, or The Mad Couple*, 1672:

Although there are but 806 Playes in all Printed, yet I know that many more have been Written and Acted, I myself have some quantity in Manuscript.

¹ I have attempted to catalogue these, *PMLA*, L (1935), 687-99, LII (1937), 905-7; LIII (1938), 624-9.

At some time between 1677 and 1703 Abraham Hill, antiquarian and bibliophile, took down the titles of a collection of manuscript plays—quite possibly Kirkman's. Hill's list contains over fifty titles, most of them belonging to the early part of the century and otherwise unknown.¹

For our purpose, the most significant collection of manuscripts was that made by the enterprising publisher Humphrey Moseley late in the Interregnum. On 9 September 1653, and 29 June 1660, Moseley entered in the Stationers' Register the titles of from eighty to ninety plays.² Had Moseley lived, he might have issued many of these plays, possibly even a Massinger folio, but death intervened and only eighteen of the plays ever found their way into print. What happened to the rest is suggested by the following sequence of events.

In the early spring of 1660 it had become apparent that the theatres were to become legitimate once more. On 29 June, Moseley effected the second, precautionary, registration of his collection, rectifying most of the many double entries for single fees made in 1653. On 30 August he wrote to Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, as follows:

Sir,

I have beene very much solicited by the gentlemen actors of the Red Bull for a note under my hand to certife unto your worship what agreement I had made with Mr Rhodes of the Cockpitt playhouse. Truly, Sir, I am so farr from any agreement with him, nor with any from him, neither did I ever consent directly or indirectly, that hee or any others should act any playes that doe belong to mee, without my knowledge and consent had and procured. And the same also I doe certify concerning the Whitefryers playhouse and players.

Sir, this is all I have to trouble you withall att present, and therefore I shall take the boldnesse to remaine,

Your Worsh. most humble Servant

Humphrey Moseley³

It is evident that Moseley's collection was known and that the newly forming theatrical companies were interested in his plays as a possible part of their repertoires. Moseley was on guard, but his health was failing. Elected one of the wardens of the Stationers' Company, 7 July 1659, he never attended a meeting of the Court,⁴ and on 31 January 1661 he died.

Moseley's will appoints his 'deare and loveing wife Anne Moseley...

¹ J. Q. Adams, 'Hill's list of early plays in manuscript', *The Library*, New Series, xx (1939), 71-99. Dr Adams kindly sent me his article before publication.

² An accurate count is impossible because of the difficulty in distinguishing between two plays entered for a single fee, and single plays with double titles. For an analysis of the list, see W. W. Greg, 'The bakings of Betsy', *The Library*, Third Series, II (1911), 225-59.

³ Edmund Malone, *Historical Account of The Rise and Progress of the English Stage*, 1800, p. 311.

⁴ Stationers' Company, Records of the Court of Assistants, Liber D, 1654/5-1679, *passim*.

and dutifull Child and onely daughter Anne Moseley' joint executrices, and legatees of 'bookes Coppies or Coppies of bookes whatsoever'. His servant John Langford was willed £5 provided 'hee abideth with my wife dureinge her shopkeepinge. . to assist her in her great busines'; and his servant Henry Penton the same sum under the same conditions.¹ Anne Moseley did no publishing after her husband's death, but she conducted the shop at least until 1672, appealing for protection several times to the Court of the Stationers' Company,² and at intervals transferring to others, usually Henry Herringman, her rights to printed plays. The present officials of the Honorable Company have permitted me to have searched the Records of the Court of Assistants, but neither there nor elsewhere is there mention of the collection of manuscript plays.

One of two things probably occurred. Either the theatrical groups, those negotiating with Moseley in August 1660, or their successors, secured the manuscripts and failed to use them (the great majority proving unsuitable in unadapted form for stage production after 1660), or else the plays simply remained in Anne Moseley's shop. In either case the probability is great that individual plays would find their way into the hands of Restoration writers. Years later, John Warburton, Somerset Herald, listed thirty-one of the Moseley plays among the manuscripts burnt by his cook. Whether Warburton ever actually possessed all the manuscripts he listed has been questioned,³ but it seems probable that a residuum of Anne Moseley's stock survived until the eighteenth century and passed into Warburton's hands *en bloc*. Below I list the Moseley, Marriott, Hill (Kirkman ?) lost manuscripts, indicating by a (W) those claimed by Warburton for his collection. The list is somewhat long simply to be placed in evidence; I include it for its bearing upon the discussion of individual playwrights to follow, and as a convenience to those who may wish to carry on investigations of their own.

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|---------|
| Beaumont | History of Madon, King of Britain | Moseley |
| Beaumont and Fletcher | A Right Woman | Moseley |
| Brome | The Lovesick Maid, or The Honor of Young Ladies (Two plays?) | Moseley |
| Brome | Wit in Madness | Moseley |

¹ P.C.C. May 46. Moseley's estate was not great. His brother Thomas Moseley, apothecary of Christchurch, London, states in his will that Humphrey owes him £225. (Will made 1 Dec 1660, P.C.C. May 49.) Anne, lacking capital to publish plays, would have been the more ready to realize on manuscripts.

² Liber D, 1654/5-1679, ff. 72, 138, 139. Her last transaction with Herringman, so far as I have discovered, is recorded in the Stationers' Register, 14 Oct. 1672.

³ W. W. Greg, *op. cit.*, pp. 258-9. I have noted an additional reason to doubt Warburton's claim ('Notes on Manuscript plays', *TLS*, 20 June 1936, p. 523), but I am inclined to believe now that he did possess all the plays he listed: my findings in the present investigation tend to bear out that supposition.

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-------------|
| Brome and Chapman | Christianetta, or Marriage and Hanging go by Destiny | Hill |
| Brome and Heywood ¹ | The Apprentice's Prize | Moseley |
| Brome and Heywood | Life and Death of Sir Martin Skink, with the Wars of the Low Countries | Moseley |
| 'Buc, G.' | The Ambitious Brother | Hill |
| Chapman | The Fatal Love (T.) | Moseley (W) |
| Chapman | A Yorkshire Gentlewoman and her Son (T) | Moseley (W) |
| Chettle | All is not Gold that Glsters | Hill |
| Davenport | The Fatal Brothers (T) | Moseley |
| Davenport | The Politic Queen, or Murder will Out (Two plays?) | Moseley |
| Davenport and Shakespeare | Henry I | Moseley (W) |
| Davenport and Shakespeare | Henry II | Moseley |
| Dekker | Gustavus King of Swethland | Moseley (W) |
| Dekker | Joconda and Astolso (C.) | Moseley (W) |
| Dekker | The Jew of Venice | Moseley |
| Dekker | Believe it is so and 'tis so | Hill |
| Dekker | Disguises, or Love in Disguise, a Petticoat Voyage | Hill |
| Dekker | The White Moor | Hill |
| Ford | Beauty in a Trance (C.) | Moseley (W) |
| Ford | The London Merchant (C.) | Moseley (W) |
| Ford | A Bad (or Good) Beginning may have a Good Ending (C) | Moseley (W) |
| Glaphthorne | The Noble Husbands ('Actors Cataloche, le Dirard etc.') | Hill |
| Glaphthorne | The Vestal (T) | Moseley (W) |
| Glaphthorne | The Noble Trial (T. or T.C.) | Moseley (W) |
| Glaphthorne | The Duchess of Fernandina (T.) | Moseley (W) |
| Lane, Philip | A Christmas Tale, or The Knight and the Cobbler | Hill |
| Le Gry | Nothing Impossible to Love (T.C.) | Moseley (W) |
| Jordan | Love hath found his Eyes | Moseley (W) |
| Marmion (or Bonen) | The Crafty Merchant | Moseley (W) |
| Massinger | The Painter | Moseley |
| Massinger | The Italian Nightpiece | Moseley |
| Massinger | The Unfortunate Piety | Moseley |
| Massinger | The Tyrant (T) | Moseley (W) |
| Massinger | Philenzo and Hypollita (T.C.) | Moseley (W) |
| Massinger | Antonio and Valia (C.) | Moseley (W) |
| Massinger | Fast and Welcome (C) | Moseley (W) |
| Massinger | Alexis the Chaste Gallant | Moseley (W) |
| Massinger | The Woman's Plot | Moseley (W) |
| Massinger | The Judge | Moseley (W) |
| Massinger | The Spanish Viceroy | Moseley |
| Massinger | The Honor of Women (C.) | Moseley (W) |
| Massinger | Minerva's Sacrifice | Moseley (W) |
| Massinger (?) | The Forced Lady (T.) | Moseley (W) |
| Massinger | The Fair Anchoress [of Pausilippo] | Moseley |
| Massinger | The City Honest Man | Moseley |
| Massinger (?) | The Orator | Moseley |
| Massinger (?) | The Noble Choice (T.C.) | Moseley |
| Middleton | The Conqueror's Custom, or The Fair Prisoner | Hill |

¹ The two Brome and Heywood titles were entered in the Register by Moseley, 8 April 1654, and another play by Brome, *The Jewish Gentleman*, was entered 4 Aug. 1640.

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|-------------|
| Middleton | The Puritan Maid, Modest Wife, and Wanton Widow | Moseley (W) |
| Rowley, W. | The Nonesuch (C.) | Moseley (W) |
| Rowley, W. | The Four Honorable Lovers (C.) | Moseley (W) |
| Rowley, W. | The Fool without Book | Moseley |
| Rowley, W. | A Knave in Print, or One for Another (Two plays?) | Moseley |
| Sampson, W. | The Widow's Prize ¹ | Moseley (W) |
| Shakespeare ² | Duke Humphrey (T.) | Moseley (W) |
| Shakespeare | The History of King Stephen | Moseley |
| Shakespeare | Iphis and Ianthe, or Marriage without a Man (Two plays?) | Moseley |
| Shakespeare and Fletcher | The History of Cardenio | Moseley |
| Shirley, H. | The Dumb Bawd | Moseley |
| Shirley, H. | The Duke of Guise | Moseley |
| Shirley, H. | Giraldo, the Constant Lover | Moseley |
| Shirley, H. | The Spanish Duke of Lerma | Moseley |
| Tourneur | The Nobleman (T.C.) | Moseley (W) |
| Tourneur | The Great Man (T.) | Moseley (W) |

(In the remaining plays the author is not listed.)

| | |
|---|----------|
| The Black Wedding | Marriott |
| The Bond Woman | Marriott |
| Castara, or Cruelty without Hate | Marriott |
| The Cloudy Queen and Singing Moor | Hill |
| The Conceits | Marriott |
| The Country Man | Moseley |
| A Court Purge | Hill |
| The Divorce | Marriott |
| The Dutch Painter and the French Brawl | Hill |
| The Eunuch (T.) | Marriott |
| The False Friend | Hill |
| The Fatal Banquet | Hill |
| The Florentine Friend | Marriott |
| A Fool and her Maidenhead soon Parted | Marriott |
| A Gentleman no Gentleman, a Metamor- phosed Courtier ('Actors Eustace, Fram- pole, Friswood, etc.') | Hill |
| The King's Mistress | Moseley |
| Look on me and Love me, or Marriage in the Dark | Hill |
| Love's Infancy | Hill |
| The Lover's Holiday, or The Bear | Hill |
| The Marriage Night | Hill |
| A Match without Money, or The Wife's Prize | Hill |
| More than Nine Days Wonder: Two Con- stant Women | Hill |
| Mull Sack, or The Looking Glass, the Bachelor, or the Hawk | Hill |
| The Noble Ravishers | Marriott |
| The Painted Lady | Hill |
| Philip of Macedon | Hill |
| Pity the Maid | Marriott |

¹ In the Hill list occurs *The Widow's Prize, or The Woman Captain*.

² See also under Davenport. Warburton listed, in addition to *Henry I* and *Duke Humphrey*, 'A play by Will Shakespear'.

| | |
|--|----------|
| The Politic Bankrupt, or Which is the Best | Moseley |
| Girl (Two plays?) | |
| The Proxy, or Love's Aftergame | Marriott |
| Salisbury Plain (C.) | Marriott |
| Spanish Preferment | Hill |
| The Supposed Inconstancy | Marriott |
| Tereus with a Pastoral ('Actors Agnostus, | Hill |
| Eupathus, etc. Actors Mufti, Nassuf, | |
| etc.') | |
| Tradeways's Tragedy | Hill |
| The Tragedy of Tomerania | Hill |
| The Triumph of Innocence | Hill |
| The Two Spanish Gentlemen | Hill |
| The Unfaithful Wife | Hill |
| The Wandering Jew | Hill |
| A Way to make a Knave Honest | Hill |
| The White Witch of Westminster, or Love | Hill |
| in a Lunacy | |
| The Widow Captain | Hill |
| The Woman's Law | Marriott |
| The Woman's Masterpiece | Marriott |
| The Wronged Widow's Tragedy | Hill |
| The Younger Brother | Marriott |
| The Younger Brother, or Male Courtesan | Hill |

Since Hill's list was made after 1677, the titles indicated as his are significant for our purpose only in relation to late Restoration drama. In the case of the Moseley plays, the greater interest attaches to the titles *not* listed by Warburton, since Warburton must have acquired a group of plays that had survived the process of attrition. Of course, any of the plays listed above may have existed in additional copies.

For the moment I shall beg the question. Is it likely that Marriott, Kirkman, or Anne Moseley would have possessed such stores of manuscript plays without either publishing them or calling the attention of producers and playwrights to them—in a theatrical era much given to reviving or adapting plays coeval in origin with those in manuscript? Or is it likely in an age when the reopening of the theatres forced playwrights to learn their craft rapidly, when gentle but unqualified amateurs aspired to be sealed of the tribe of playhouse wits, and when professional writers were both predatory and furtive, that no use would be made of the opportunity offered? Let us believe the lesser wonder.

That the hypothesis offered here has come tardily forth is no argument against it. The very process of adapting manuscripts would have removed them from circulation and thus concealed traces. The nature of the unacknowledged adaptations previously discussed is known only as a result of literary discovery, extending over many years and dependent upon the separate existence of printed parent plays. Had there been no prints there would have been no discoveries, and the adaptations would

remain unsuspected. The pioneer in such discoveries wrote that he would expose 'our Modern Plagiaries by detecting *Part* of their Thefts. I say *Part* because I cannot be suppos'd to have trac'd them in All.'¹ Perhaps he spoke more truly than he knew. It is amusing to think of playwrights, secure in their use of manuscript sources, laughing up their sleeves at Langbaine. It is even more amusing to imagine Langbaine's listing, as the sources of an adapted play, the sources of the parent play—in works which the adapter had never heard of. How humiliating to find oneself diminished from thief to receiver! Something of the sort may sometimes have occurred. At any rate, I am sure that some Restoration plays are unrecognized adaptations of 'lost' Elizabethan plays, simply on the basis of antecedent probabilities, without reference to particular instances. But it is a doubting age, and I shall try to supply instances.

3. CLUE

One of the Moseley manuscripts has furnished the substance for a *cause célèbre*. The case is so nearly parallel to those I shall argue that a brief review of it will make my claims seem less abrupt.

In the Christmas season of 1612–13 the King's Men presented at Court 'Cardenno', and on 8 June 1613 'Cardenna' for the entertainment of the Savoyard ambassador. Entered by Humphrey Moseley in the Stationers' Register, 9 September 1653, was 'The History of Cardennio by Mr Fletcher & Shakespeare.' The ascription of authorship is fairly credible in view of the collaboration of Fletcher and Shakespeare in 1613. *Cardennio* may have been excluded from the 1623 folio (like *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, published as by Shakespeare and Fletcher in 1634) because mainly the work of the lesser collaborator. No more is heard of the play until there appeared *Double Falsehood, or The Distrest Lovers Written Originally by W. Shakespeare, And now Revised and Adapted to the Stage By Mr Theobald*, acted at Drury Lane in 1727, published the following year. It is the Cardennio story, based, according to the author, upon a Shakespearean manuscript in his possession.

Theobald's claim has been often discussed, in varying tones of belief and disbelief; there is no need to review the controversy. Although *Double Falsehood* itself is not very interesting, it is, in a wide application of the term, *Fletcherian*. Whether Shakespeare had any hand in its original is not here at issue.

I see no good reason to doubt that Theobald had got hold of the Moseley manuscript, or copies of it, and acted, if not sensibly, at least in

¹ G. Langbaine, 'The Preface', *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets*, 1691.

good faith. He was capable of making peculiar decisions. On one occasion 'a Gentleman, a Watch-maker in the City', brought him a play, which was bad until Theobald 'created it anew'. He considered this just grounds for appropriation and, when the watchmaker protested, he threatened to print the original play, 'and leave the World to judge of [its] Grammar, Concord, or English'.¹ Even Theobald's account of the provenance of the Cardennio manuscript, savoring though it does of cock-and-bull and tending to discredit his whole story, may have a reasonable explanation. One of the copies of the play, he said, had survived as the property of Shakespeare's illegitimate daughter The lady is otherwise unknown, but possibly Mary Davenant is indicated. As the widow of Sir William Davenant, active about the theatre long after her husband's death, she is not at all unlikely to have possessed such a relic. In the early eighteenth century Sir William Davenant was rumoured to have been Shakespeare's illegitimate son: Theobald may have been guilty only of misconstruing and elaborating common gossip. Of course the best evidence of Theobald's *bona fides* is the fact that records of the early history of the Cardennio play, with its Shakespearean associations, were unknown to him and his contemporaries and were therefore unavailable as grounds upon which to base a fraud. It is also well worth noting that Theobald was willing to exhibit the old manuscript upon which *Double Falsehood* was based.²

The episode is pertinent for several reasons. It illustrates the lack of respect accorded original dramatic manuscripts even by those who should have known better. It illustrates the fact that even as late as 1727 a 'lost' Elizabethan play might be presented to the theatrical and reading public in metamorphosed form. It illustrates, also, to what extent the process of adaptation can conceal the quality of underlying work.³ Even Theobald's direct admission 'has been much doubted. Except for the admission, we have in the *Cardennio-Double Falsehood* episode an instance of the very thing I am trying to prove.

4. JOHN FORD—SIR ROBERT HOWARD

Sir Robert Howard's pseudo-historical drama *The Great Favourite, or The Duke of Lerma*, produced and published in 1668, has surprised critics with its excellence. Mr Arundell, its recent editor, calls the play 'daringly successful in its novel untragic seriousness', and praises especially its

¹ See Theobald's own self-righteous address to the reader. *The Perfidious Brother*, 1715.

² A letter in which he makes the offer is printed in *Historical MSS. Comm.*, xxix, pt. 6, p. 20. I owe this reference to my colleague Mr John Cadwalader.

³ There is ample illustration of this in the Restoration adaptations of which the parent plays have survived.

power of characterization.¹ Mr Nicoll remarks that 'the pure Maria with the complicated touches in her psychology, and the young king, make up a story that causes us to think more highly of Dryden's collaborator, enemy and friend, than his other works would have warranted'.² The Reverend Mr Summers concurs: 'Howard shows a genius, which to my mind informs the whole play, but which save for *The Duke of Lerma* might have been denied him.'³

Whence, we must ask, came sudden *inspiration* to a playwright whose previous plays had been consistently mediocre? Howard's contemporaries asked the very question, and answered it with a charge that his play had been stolen.⁴ In *A Defence of an Essay of Dramatic Poesy* Dryden voices current suspicion with skilful innuendo:

...he [Howard] gives me the compellation of 'The Author of a *Dramatic Essay*', which is a little discourse in dialogue, for the most part borrowed from the observations of others. Therefore, that I may not be wanting to him in civility, I return his compliment by calling him 'The Author of *The Duke of Lerma*'.

In publishing the play, Howard felt obliged to answer the rumours. His answer is thus glossed by the Reverend Mr Summers:

A play called *The Duke of Lerma*, had been left with the King's Company to dispose of as they pleased. This was submitted to Howard for his opinion, who when he read it found the script frankly impossible although the historical events certainly gave opportunity for a good drama. Thereupon Charles Hart, knowing that Sir Robert was going into the country, persuaded him to employ his leisure on a piece on the same subject.⁵

Compare the amiable interpretation with Howard's own statement:

For the subject I came accidentally to write upon it. For a gentleman brought a play to the King's Company, called *The Duke of Lerma*, and by them I was desired to peruse it, and return my opinion, whether I thought it fit for the stage. After I had read it, I acquainted them that in my judgment it would not be of much use for such a design, since the contrivance scarce would merit the name of a plot (and some of that assisted by a disguise), and it ended abruptly: and on the person of Philip the 3 there was fixed such a mean character, and on the daughter of the Duke of Lerma such a vicious one, that I could not but judge it unfit to be presented by any that had a respect, not only to princes, but indeed to either man or woman.

And about that time, being to go into the country, I was persuaded by Mr Hart to make it my diversion there, that so great a hint might not be lost, as the Duke of Lerma saving himself in his last extremity by his unexpected disguise, which is as well in the true story as in the old play; and besides that and the names, my altering the most part of the characters, and the whole design, made me incapable to use much more, though perhaps written with higher style and thoughts than I could attain to.

Several things are clear. However much he might minimize his debt, after the fashion of the Restoration playwright, Howard's *The Great*

¹ D. D. Arundell, *Dryden and Howard, 1664-1668. The Text of...The Duke of Lerma*, 1929, p. 208.

² *Restoration Drama*, ed. 1928, p. 127.

³ *The Playhouse of Pepys*, 1935, p. 178.

⁴ It is odd that modern critics have been so trusting: C. N. Thurber, in his remarks prefacing his edition of *The Committee*, *Univ. of Ill. Studies in Lang. and Lit.*, VII (1921), 29, like the rest, confines himself to praise of the exceptional merit of *The Great Favourite*.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 176.

Favourite, or The Duke of Lerma, is not an original play but an adaptation. Furthermore—and strange that the fact has aroused no curiosity—the piece he reworked was an *old play*. An old play in 1668 would probably mean one written before 1642. Since the historical events interpreted in *The Great Favourite* extend to 1629, we have a fairly narrow range for the date of the original play, and a fairly restricted group from which to select the original author.

Among the Moseley manuscripts was a play called *The Spanish Duke of Lerma*, ascribed to Henry Shirley. It is one of the manuscripts which did *not* descend to Warburton. Howard revised the old manuscript at the request of Charles Hart, and Charles Hart had been a member of the Red Bull company in 1660¹ at the time Moseley wrote his letter to the Master of the Revels at the solicitation of 'the gentlemen actors of the Red Bull'.² To me it seems reasonably clear where Howard's *old play* came from. *The Spanish Duke of Lerma*, I believe, must have been the play. Henry Shirley, however, could not have been its author.

Henry Shirley is known to us as a dramatist only by the four titles entered in the Stationers' Register in 1653, and by a single extant drama, *The Martyred Soldier*, published in 1638. *The Martyred Soldier* itself may be a work of collaboration;³ however, we have no choice but to estimate Henry Shirley's powers as a dramatist by this play. *The Martyred Soldier* is a quaint religious drama, rudimentary in characterization and rude in style. Howard would never have admitted that any play by the same hand that produced this one was 'perhaps written with higher style and thoughts' than he could attain to.⁴

Few playwrights active between 1629 and 1642 would have won such a tribute from Sir Robert Howard, who was an intelligent critic although one predisposed to judge harshly of any but the more refined school of playwrighting. James Shirley⁵ and Davenant may be eliminated as

¹ A. Nicoll, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

² See above, p. 291.

³ A. M. Clark, *Thomas Heywood*, 1931, pp. 295–300.

⁴ The Duke of Lerma died in 1625, Henry Shirley in 1627, but the original author of *The Great Favourite* was aware of the liaison between Philip IV and the actress Maria Calderon (see H. A. Rennert, *The Spanish Stage in the time of Lope de Vega*, 1909, p. 164, n. 1). Maria Calderon, as Arundell points out, was the historical original of Maria, daughter of Lerma, in the play. A hint in the last scene indicates that the playwright was aware that Maria Calderon bore Philip a son—John of Austria was born 17 April, 1629. This touch might have been added by Howard, but the date of the historical ingredients alone tend to eliminate Henry Shirley as original author.

⁵ James Shirley's *The Politician* is entered immediately above *The Spanish Duke of Lerma* in the Stationers' Register, and the identity of surnames would have encouraged clerical error. However, if *The Spanish Duke of Lerma* had been James Shirley's, we would probably have its licensing record, and it would probably have been published (as was *The Politician*, in 1655). Shirley was co-operating with Moseley in the issuing of his plays (see *Six New Plays*, 1653).

unlikely to have left available seizable property. Of those who remain, Massinger and Ford are the most likely candidates, and Ford I am sure is our man. If Henry Shirley had anything to do with the original of Howard's play, it must have been as author of a comic underplot which Howard has expunged. More probably, one of Ford's¹ plays had simply been inserted among the relics of Henry Shirley, and had been entered in the Register under the latter's name. This is precisely what happened to Massinger's *Parliament of Love*, entered by Moseley in the Register, 29 June 1660, as by William Rowley, apparently because associated with two of Rowley's plays.²

The Great Favourite, or The Duke of Lerma bears the stamp of Ford in its plot materials, its characters, and its style. The design of the play is simple. The Duke of Lerma tries to recover his lost power in Spain by prostituting his lovely daughter Maria to young Philip IV. Maria becomes the King's mistress only in report. She sacrifices reputation and filial love and duty in order to save the King from her father's machinations. Philip makes Maria his Queen at last, and Lerma wins immunity from punishment by donning the cardinal's hat which he has secretly obtained from the Pope. Let us observe at once that an elaborate fiction has been grafted upon history in this plot: the historical Duke of Lerma had a son pitted against him, but no daughter. The fiction, even upon first impression, is suggestive of Ford, but we need not depend upon impressions.

In his use of plot materials Ford shows an exceptionally narrow range. He constantly repeats himself. We are justified, then, in drawing tentative conclusions when we discover in Ford's known plays every situation and every major character of *The Great Favourite*. Its plot is a variation of the main plot of Ford's *The Fancies Chaste and Noble*, wherein Castamela plays the part of Maria, her brother Livio the part of Lerma, and the Marquis of Sienna (and his nephew) the part of Philip IV. The resemblance in theme of the two plays is basic, and it is a theme that gave Ford a chance to employ his favourite trick. Ford loves to expose chastity to danger, and to let its loss or preservation

¹ Three plays by Ford were among the Moseley manuscripts, and the title of one of these, *Beauty in a Trance*, is applicable to Howard's play, if we read *trance* in one of its seventeenth-century meanings as a state of suspended judgement or indecision. However, to suppose this play Howard's original, we must assume that *two* plays had been written on the Lerma story, and must ignore the fact that *Beauty in a Trance* is listed in his collection by Warburton.

² *The Nonesuch*, and *The Book of the Four Honorable Lovers*. It is possible that the error may apply in the opposite way and that all three of the plays were Massinger's. W. Rowley's name seems to have been affixed to the copy of *The Parliament of Love* listed by Warburton. Moseley made additional errors, but I believe his ascriptions of authorship are never intentionally fraudulent.

hang perilously in the balance while onlookers (both among the characters in the play and the members of the audience) are compelled to believe the worst. Even the details of his methods of plot-making appear. Maria, like Spinella in *The Lady's Trial*, withdraws from actual sight while under a moral cloud, to reappear when it is convenient for her to do so. Unlike most of the situations in the play, Lerma's device of escaping punishment by claiming papal jurisdiction has an historical basis, so that we should not expect its occurrence elsewhere in Ford. But the equivalent of this situation does indeed occur, in Act III of *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*,¹ where a cardinal, claiming papal jurisdiction, saves from punishment a contemptible murderer.

Just as striking is the Fordian nature of the characters of *The Great Favourite*, with their bursts of vehemence alternating with sudden moods of tenderness, with their propensity to weep and speak on bended knees, yet curious capacity for intellectual calm. Lerma himself is one of Ford's impudent but admirable sinners. Maria is one of his seductive heroines, responding ambiguously to the love of a man of high station and therefore suspected of unchastity. She most nearly resembles Castamela of *The Fancies*, but we are reminded too of Flavia of the same play, Spinella of *The Lady's Trial*, Bianca of *Love's Sacrifice*, and Penthea of *The Broken Heart*. Philip is the typical prince of Ford's plays, like Palador in *The Lover's Melancholy*—one whom thwarted love has numbed to a lethargy (the word used by Ford and the word used in *The Great Favourite*). Medina is the character so familiar in Ford—railing at a woman for a lustful act which she has committed only in his own evil imaginings. All have that psychological complexity so typical of John Ford, so untypical of Sir Robert Howard.

And finally the style. With the first speech of the play, the Prologue over, we want to write 'Exit Howard and enter Ford':

Repulse upon repulse, like waves thrown back,
That slide to hang upon obdurate rocks—
The King shot run at me, and there lies
Forgiving all the world but me alone,
As if that Heaven too, as well as he,
Had scratched me out of numbers. At the last
He turned his feeble eyes away from me,
As dying men from sins that had misled 'em,
Blasting my hopes and theirs that hang upon me.
Thus all those mighty merits of my family
Are going to his grave, there to be buried.
And I myself have hung upon his frowns,
Like dew upon a cloud, till shaken off

¹ Lerma became a cardinal in 1618. *'Tis Pity* may have preceded *The Spanish Duke of Lerma*, which probably dates between 1630 and 1634, the period of *Perkin Warbeck*.

In a cold shower and frozen as it fell,
 Starving my growth with this untimely frost.
 But—I fondly prate away my thoughts,
 Till I have made 'em nothing—like myself.
 See—Here are the parts of my full ruin.
 These decayed outhouses show the chief building
 Wants reparation....

A case for Ford could be argued solely on the basis of verbal parallels—a remarkable fact considering that we have before us a sophisticated text. In discussing the authorship of *The Queen* and *The Spanish Gipsy*,¹ H. Dugdale Sykes has analysed Ford's diction and used words of frequent occurrence as a test of authorship. Such a test must be applied cautiously, but let us observe that many of the words specified by Sykes occur as commonly in *The Great Favourite* as in Ford's acknowledged plays and in those claimed for him on stylistic grounds. In speaking of Ford's partiality for the contractions *t'ee* for *to you* and *d'ee* for *do you*, Sykes affirms 'This of itself is almost sufficient to prove Ford's presence, for no other dramatist of the time habitually adopts these abbreviations.'² The contraction *d'ee* for *do you* occurs in *The Great Favourite*. Sykes has noted Ford's fondness for the phrase *traitor to honour, traitor to friendship*, etc. In *The Great Favourite* occur the lines,

...dost thou swell that art my creature?
 Thy breath is nurtured from my bounty:
 Why art thou then a traitor to my trust?³

The words *bounty* and *creature*, incidentally, are in Sykes's list of Ford's favourites. Parallels such as these may be explained away as accidental and inconclusive. There is one, however, which cannot be thus dismissed.

Ford habitually speaks of weakness and vice as infections, employing the metaphor in every play, not once but several times. Observe:

Thou hast brought back a worse infection with thee,—
 Infection of thy mind. *The Broken Heart*, III, 4.

The court, it does infect me with the sloth
 Of sleep and surfeit. *The Lover's Melancholy*, II, 1.

I wish Heaven
 Or my infected honour white again. *Perkin Warbeck*, I, 3.

...my infected fate
 Has driven these to seek more healthful airs.
The Great Favourite, I, 1.

...Pride, the dropsy of infected souls
 That swelled 'em first, then burst 'em. *The Great Favourite*, II, 1.

¹ *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama*, 1924.

² *Ibid.*, p. 188, but actually Brome also employs these contractions.

³ Act III, Scene 3. See also 'traitor to my prince's soul' (IV, 1), 'what a traitor is my love' (II, 2).

When the vice is lust, the infection induces corruption, usually specified as leprosy. Observe again:

Beg Heaven to cleanse the leprosy of lust
That rots thy soul.

'Tis Pity She's a Whore, I, 1.

Get from me strumpet, infamous whore, leprosy of my blood.

Love's Sacrifice, III, 1.

A whorish itch infects thy blood, a leprosy of raging lust.

The Fancies, IV, 1.

...set your soul free from that gilded frame
Whose unseen rottenness corrupts it.

The Great Favourite, IV, 1.

'Tis pity forces me to this violence—
The pity of thy blood, I had a share in,
Before it was infected with this leprosy...

The Great Favourite, IV, 1.

Revealed to us here is something more than verbal parallelism: it is a habit of mind.

The passage last quoted continues:

The pity of thy youth, thy beauteous youth,¹
Like a fair flower plucked up by the root
When 'twas but newly budding, before time
Could show it to the world how sweet it was.

Are not these the very cadences of Ford? Or the following:

Feigned accusations and a little time
Will kill all wonder—which is shorter lived
Than dreams of children, or old women's tales.

The Great Favourite, IV, 2.

...what wit or art
Could counsel, I have practis'd; but, alas,
I find all these but dreams, and old men's tales.

'Tis Pity She's a Whore, I, 3.

That script which Sir Robert found *frankly impossible* did indeed contain a higher style than he could attain to. Some passages were transformed into couplets, and some no doubt chastened and clarified in the regrettable manner of Restoration adaptation, but others, I believe, remained virtually untouched, and still sound with the chime of Ford's melancholy music.

What would the original play have been like—before censored by Howard? Maria, says he in his preface, was too *vicious*. Yet speeches by Maria, descended intact, I should guess, from the original play, are quite virtuous.

He talkt to me of nothing but of goodness,
And when he spoke of that, (as he must needs)
He named my mother, and by chance I wept.

¹ Compare 'This youth, this fair-faced youth...' in *Lover's Melancholy*, I, 1.

In Ford's play Maria, like Bianca in *Love's Sacrifice*, might well have been both vicious and virtuous: Howard had only to delete the vicious side. Lerma's attitude to his daughter, whom he describes as

...sweeter than the spring wreath'd in the arms of budding flowers . . .

may in the original play have been even more sinister than in *The Great Favourite*, and on moral grounds some of Howard's alterations were probably justified. In imagination we can reconstruct that original play which 'ended abruptly', though we wish the exercise were unnecessary. As it is, I feel sure that admirers of John Ford have another play to read.

In the next section, I shall canvass the possibility that Mr Hart passed out manuscripts for revision, not only to Howard, but to John Dryden.

5. RICHARD BROME—JOHN DRYDEN

Brome manuscripts should have proved useful to Restoration playwrights. When the latter wrote comedy of humours, they praised Jonson but followed the manner of Brome. Brome's comedies are only superficially akin to Jonson's, essentially they are, although skilful and entertaining, decidedly guilty plays: always the action spins on an axis of sexual dereliction. Brome is less a Jonson in buckram than a Ford in motley.

It will be necessary to describe Brome's formula.¹ In *The City Wit*, Josina attempts to employ her own husband (disguised) as pimp and paramour. In *The Northern Lass*, Constance is confused with a prostitute of the same name; when she goes mad with love, she imagines herself with child. In *The Weeding of Covent Garden*, Dorcas poses as a prostitute. In *The Novella*, Victoria poses as a Venetian courtesan and places her virginity on sale at an exorbitant rate. In *The Sparagus Garden*, Annabel pretends to have been seduced, and uses a pillow in order to feign pregnancy. In *A Mad Couple Well Matched*, Lady Thrivewell twice appears in the light of an adulteress. In *The Damselle*, Alice is courted in what purports to be a bagnio where virginity is offered as a lottery prize. In *The Court Beggar*, Lady Strangelove's habit of dalliance almost leads to her being ravished, whereupon she falls in love with the would-be ravisher. In earlier comedy prostitutes were wont to pose as ladies; in Brome's comedy ladies pose as prostitutes. His heroines all

¹ In his best comedies, *The Antipodes* and *The Jovial Crew*, Brome departs from his own formula.

touch pitch. The audience is treated to a display of chastity in jeopardy or under suspicion,¹ and the language of the masquerading ladies is too-convincingly coarse. Add a usurious old guardian with designs upon his ward's inheritance; a shopkeeping husband and wife prone to adultery; an assortment of bankrupts, blades, foolish citizens and eccentrics; and a dialogue that is gruff,² animated, colloquial, full of tags and of puns and similitudes upon sex—and you have the typical comedy of Richard Brome.

Not every Restoration comedy that follows the Bromean formula am I claiming as a redaction of a Bromean manuscript. The plays to be discussed have survived a careful process of elimination.³

In 1675 R. Bentley published *The Mistaken Husband*, with the following note:

This Play was left in Mr. Dryden's hands many years since: The Author of it was unknown to him, and return'd not to claim it; 'Tis therefore to be presum'd that he is dead.

After twelve years expectation, Mr. Dryden gave it to the Players, having upon perusal of it, found that it deserv'd a better Fate than to be buried in obscurity: I have heard him say, that finding a Scene wanting, he supply'd it; and many have affirm'd, that the stile of it is proper to the Subject, which is what the French call Basse Comedy....⁴

Dryden never directly contradicted Bentley's statement, and the tendency has been to accept it as true. Saintsbury, however, was sceptical. He included the play in his edition—with the following interesting comment:

But the verse does not seem to me to be Dryden's, nor the phrase, nor the cast of

¹ As in Ford; see above, pp. 300-1.

² Brome uses more 'strengtheners', I believe, than does any other playwright. Innumerable sentences begin with *S'ld* and end with *troe*, *ha*, *I warrant you*, etc. *Phew*, *whew*, etc. are common, and such words as *devil*, *coxcomb*, *hang*, *claw*, and *kick* occur with abnormal frequency.

³ A play which should not be eliminated from consideration, perhaps, is the old-fashioned, anonymous comedy, *The Factious Citizen, or The Melancholy Visioner*, 1685 (originally published as *Mr Turbulent*, 1682). It is Bromean in plot materials and characters, and occasionally even in style; but if based on an older text, it has been extensively rewritten.

John Wilson's *The Cheats*, 1664, may be an adaptation of a manuscript original. Although the first of Wilson's four plays, it is the most professional among them. To contemporary charges that he had stolen the play, Wilson's reply is curious. 'I am in possession, and a bare "they say", without showing it, will not be sufficient to evict me out of it.' ('The Author to the Reader.') M. Nahm's edition, 1934, proves that there are elements in the text dependent upon the writings (1660) and probable sayings of Heydon, a Rosicrucian, but this does not preclude the possibility of an earlier play as the original (I am inclined to reject *The Hectors*, 1655, named by Dr Nahm, as the source, since the resemblances seem purely generic. If there was a manuscript original, I should suspect from the style of *The Cheats* the presence of Middleton rather than of Brome. The fate of Middleton's MS. *The Puritan Maid, Modest Wife, and Wanton Widow* challenges attention. Part of the title fits the non-Gallic portion of Betterton's *The Amorous Widow*, c. 1670 (pub. 1706), but the title in its entirety fits no Restoration play that I have read. The title occurs in Warburton's list, and the MS. may have escaped earlier attention.

⁴ 'The Bookseller to the Reader.'

thought; in particular, the facture of the blank verse strikes my ear as wholly different from his: indeed I should set it down as decidedly older than his time.¹

Saintsbury asks why anyone should have given Dryden a play in 1663 before he himself was known as a dramatist. He might also have asked what professional dramatist (for *The Mistaken Husband* is assuredly the work of a professional) was giving away plays in 1663.

The text of *The Mistaken Husband* itself supplies the clue to the mystery. Bentley was misleading only in a single detail, and that detail one in which he himself had probably been misled.² In Act III, Scene 2, occurs the following casual allusion:

...The Thames is frozen above-Bridge, Sir, and
Sackcloth-Towns are built upon't: 'tis such a Season, Sir.
Zeal cannot warm a man: for a Fanaticks Teeth, as he
Pass'd by just now, chattered, as if one had plaid a Tune
On the Gridiron.

The Thames had not been frozen over since the winter of 1634-5³ (when Dryden was a toddler in Northamptonshire), and the lines would scarcely have been written into a play as late as 1663 or 1675 by Dryden or anyone else. There is an allusion to the great frost of 1634-5 in Brome's *The Sparagus Garden*, Act II, Scene 2:

Heyday! so last frost she long'd to ride on one of the Dromedaries over the Thames, when great men were pleas'd to goe over it a foote.

The manuscript 'left in Mr Dryden's hands', the author of which was 'unknown to him', was probably written about the same time as *The Sparagus Garden*, c. 1635, and I believe the author was Richard Brome.

The Mistaken Husband follows the Brome formula: in both materials and style it resembles his known comedies. Mrs Manley, after seven years of unconsummated marriage, cohabits with an impostor whom she mistakes for her husband. The cheat discovered, she prefers the impostor to the husband. A divorce and second marriage⁴ permit her to remain in technical possession of her 'virtue'. This is precisely Brome. Dryden's part seems to me to have been mainly simplification of the plot. The frequent parenthetical constructions, the abrupt and often purposeless alternation of prose with blank verse ('decidedly older' than Dryden's), and, above all, the diction, the turn of phrase, the general atmosphere,

¹ Scott and Saintsbury, *Dramatic Works of John Dryden*, VIII (1882), 647.

² He says the play was left in Dryden's hands, and *assumes* it was left by the author, as it has been assumed that the Lerma play (see above, p. 298) was left in Howard's hands *by the author*, but in neither case is the one who delivered the manuscript explicitly identified as the author. In both cases, it is likely that Charles Hart was parcelling out Moseley manuscripts.

³ H. B. Wheatley and P. Cunningham, *London Past and Present*, 1891, III, 363. There was no great frost between 1635 and 1683.

⁴ An unconsummated marriage and a divorce (or the appearance of such) occur in Brome's *Northern Lass*.

all spell Brome¹—or so I believe. To others I recommend successive reading of *The Sparagus Garden*, *The Mistaken Husband*, and *A Mad Couple Well Matched*.

I pass to what I consider a more interesting possibility—that not one manuscript but two were left with Dryden, and that *The Wild Gallant* is also an adaptation of a lost play by Brome.

Let Dryden himself offer the first testimony in the case:

The Plot was not Originally my own · but so Alter'd by me (whether for the better or worse, I know not) that, whoever the Author was, he could not have challeng'd a Scene of it.²

In his excellent discussion of Dryden's sources Dr N. B. Allen glosses the playwright's words as follows:

Dryden does not necessarily mean by this that he had any one source for the whole play. If he does refer to any one previous work, it is probably to the *Decameron*, to Shirley's *Lady of Pleasure*, or to Brome's *Sparagus Garden*, from each of which, it will be shown, he got a definite suggestion.³

I must differ from Dr Allen. Of none of the three works mentioned need Dryden have said 'whoever the Author was'. Clearly, I believe, *one* work is referred to—a play which Dryden has 'alter'd'. Mention in the Prologue of 'a Spanish plot'—actually an allusion⁴ to Tuke's *Adventures of Five Hours* adapted from Coello—has led nearly all commentators on *The Wild Gallant* to assume a source in Spanish drama, despite the explicit statement in the same Prologue, 'This play is English, and the Growth your own. .'.⁵ Dryden has as good as told us that he has adapted an English play whose author was unknown to him. Had the original play been in print, it would long since have been identified; *ergo* it reached Dryden in manuscript. The case of *The Wild Gallant* offers an exact parallel with that of *The Mistaken Husband*—except that this time Dryden himself, not Bentley, is our informant.

The Wild Gallant, like *The Mistaken Husband*, follows the Brome formula. Lady Constance is the heroine who touches pitch. In the true

¹ Brome's source may have been the hypothetical Spanish novel upon which 'Don Martin' in le Sieur de Garouville's *L'Amant Oïssif*, 1671, was based. M. Summers has noted the resemblance between the story of 'Don Martin' and that of *The Mistaken Husband*, and remarks the difficulty of considering 'Don Martin', 1671, as the source of a play of 1663 (M. Summers, *Dryden. The Dramatic Works*, iv, 5). M. Summers (*ibid.*, iv, 463) points out that *The Mistaken Husband* was evidently written for a platform stage, as likewise was *The Wild Gallant*. A platform stage was still available in 1663 but not in 1675.

² 'Preface', *The Wild Gallant*, 1667.

³ Ned B. Allen, *The Sources of John Dryden's Comedies*, 1935, p. 9 n.

⁴ The fact admits of no doubt. The point was made by Allison Gaw, 'Tuke's "Adventures of Five Hours" in Relation to the "Spanish plot" and to John Dryden', *Publ. Univ. Pennsylvania, Series in Philology and Literature*, xiv (1917), 1-61. N. B. Allen, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-7, has reminded scholars of Gaw's findings.

⁵ 'Prologue to *The Wild Gallant*, as it was first Acted.'

Bromean manner, she simulates pregnancy with a pillow in order to win through to marriage with her gallant. The scene in which the male members of the Nonsuch family are made to believe they are pregnant has frequently bemused admirers of Dryden, but the scene would surprise no one in a comedy by Brome. Too Bromean to be mere imitations are Shopkeeper Bibber and his wife Frances—to whom gallants are indebted 'for Chamber-rent, and Diet, and many a good thing besides, that shall be nameless':

Lov. Nay but good Landlady—

Franc. Will good Landlady set on the Pot, as they say; or make the Jack goe; then I'll hear you.

Bib. Now she's too much on t'other hand: hold your prating Frances....

Franc. I did but lay the Law open to him, as they say, whereby to get our money in: but if you knew how he has us'd me, Husband.

Bib. Has he us'd you Frances; put so much more into his Bill for Lodging.¹

The Wild Gallant, indifferently successful in 1663, was revived with alterations in 1667, and the text we have is that of the revival. Since even in the version of 1663 the source play had been 'so alter'd . . . that, whoever the Author was, he could not have Challeng'd a Scene of it', we might expect, in the version of 1667, little of Brome's language to remain (assuming for the moment that Brome is our man). Certainly *The Wild Gallant* has been rewritten more completely than *The Mistaken Husband*, and many of the smarter portions² are wholly in Dryden's language; nevertheless, I believe that the hand of Brome is frequently traceable. I shall limit myself to a single illustration. Speeches which frequently repeat the term of address seemed to Brome so irresistibly funny that he employed the device at least once in nearly every comedy:

Thomas your hopes are vaine, *Thomas* in seating mee here to overreach, or underreach any body. I am weary of this Mechanick course *Thomas*; and of this courser habit, as I have told you divers and sundry times *Thomas*, and indeed of you *Thomas* that confine me to 't. . .

A Mad Couple Well Matched, II, 1.

I am a poore Tradesman Mr. *Crasie*, keep both a Linnen and a Wollen Drapers shop, Mr. *Crasie*, according to my name, Mr. *Crasie*, and would be loth to lend my money, Mr. *Crasie*, to be laught at among my neighbours, Mr. *Crasie*, as you are Mr. *Crasie*.

The City Wit, I, 2.

No indeed *John Brittleware*; the Asparagus has done its part; but you have not done your part *John*; and if you were an honest man, *John*, you would make sir *Hughes* words good of the Asparagus, and be kinder to me; you are not kind to your own wife *John*...

The Sparagus Garden, III, 8.

¹ Act I, Scene 1. Compare Bumpsey and Magdalen in *The Damselle*, Saleware and Alicia in *A Mad Couple Well Matched*, Brittleware and Rebecca in *The Sparagus Garden*, etc.

² The contrasting styles in *The Wild Gallant* have compelled Dr Allen (*op. cit.*, p. 22) to infer that the 'Jonsonian' portions of the play may have been drafted by Dryden before 1658—an unnecessary inference if there was a manuscript original. Similar disparity in its parts occurs in Etherege's *Love in a Tub*, but here the more primitive portions do indeed seem to date from the Interregnum period.

O my deare *Bump*! Art thou there? Thou mayst kisse, and forgive me all over too, for any harm, or dishonesty, though the place be as they say—at a word, *Bump*. Thou mayst believe me, I came but to learn carriage of the Body, not to carry no bodies body, but my owne body, *Bump*. No truely, truely *Bump* . . .

The Damselle, v, 1.

My Mistriss commends her best love unto your Worship, and desires to know how your Worship came home last Night, and how your Worship have rested, and how your Worship does this morning? She hopes the best of your Worships health, and would be glad to see your Worship at your Worships best leasure.

The Northern Lass, i, 6.

Yes ant like your Lordship upon some private notice given to me an't like your Lordship, that she was at a private lodging ant like your Lordship, with a private friend ant like your Lordship, over I went, and found her abed ant like your Lordship, and Mr. *Bellamy* even ready to go to bed to her ant like your Lordship.

A Mad Couple Well Matched, v, 1.

And't please your worship, it was seventeen pounds and a Noble, yesterday at noon, your worship knows And then your worship came home ill last night, and complain'd of your worships head; and I sent for 3 Dishes of Tea for your good worship, and that was six pence more, and please your worship's honor.

The Wild Gallant, i, 1.

My Cinque I play here Sir, my Cater here, Sir. now for you, Sir, but first I'll drink to you Sir; upon my faith I'll do you reason, Sir: mine was thus full Sir pray mind your play, Sir . . .

The Wild Gallant, i, 1.

Here *William*! this is a Judgement, as they say, upon you *William*; for trusting Wits, and calling Gentlemen to the Tavern *William*.

The Wild Gallant, v, 1.¹

To me the style of large portions of *The Wild Gallant* seems to resemble Brome's more than Dryden's in his later comedies. Dryden himself placed small value upon his early work. He must have believed that he had done enough original writing in *The Wild Gallant* to establish ownership, but he disparaged the play; and he never even claimed *The Mistaken Husband*. There is nothing intrinsically improbable, or discreditable, about Dryden's beginning his play-writing career, like Shakespeare, by cobbling the work of predecessors.²

¹ To play the game through, I quote the following from *The Mistaken Husband*, i, 2:

Hazzard. Honest Thomas, how dost thou? how hast done this long time honest Thomas?
Thomas Troth Sir, as you see, I want Clothes, and money, and the best can do no more Sir. . . . And truly Sir, I cannot know you by instinct. it may be you know me, but truly Sir I never saw you before.

Hazzard. Thomas, I did not think you would so easily forget your friends; not know me Thomas!

² I have not tried to relate the two plays discussed with specific titles by Brome. In both cases the original author's name seems to have been unknown to Dryden, so that the manuscripts could not have contained the author's name, as those attributed to Brome by Moseley must have done. Considerable work by Brome must have remained unprinted. He was once under contract to supply three plays a year to the Salisbury Court Theatre. Such plays as *The Woman's Masterpiece*, or even *Marriage without a Man* (given as a second title to 'Shakespeare's' *Iphis and Ianthé*) may have been his: I mention these titles for illustration because they would fit the originals of the Dryden plays. I shall describe elsewhere my pursuit of Brome manuscripts in the comedies of Shadwell, Behn, and D'Urfey. Most of the material must be highly speculative, but I believe that D'Urfey's *Richmond Heiress*, or a *Woman Once in the Right* levied upon Brome's lost *Wit in Madness*. The fate of the Massinger plays, some of which may have been rewritten as heroic tragedies, I shall also discuss elsewhere.

6. 'SHAKESPEARE AND DAVENPORT'—BANCROFT AND MOUNTFORT

All problems concerning Shakespeare are, of course, momentous, and involved. The least momentous are not always the least involved, and the reader of what ensues may have to call upon certain reserves of patience.

Among the titles entered in the Stationers' Register by Humphrey Moseley on 9 September 1653 appears

Henry the first, & Hen: the 2d, by Shakespeare & Davenport,¹
and among those entered on 29 June 1660

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| The History of King Stephen | } by Will: Shakspeare |
| Duke Humphrey, a Tragedy | |
| Iphis & Ianthé or a Marriage without a Man | |
| The Fatal Brothers, a Tragedy | } by Robt Davenport ² |
| The Politick Queen, or murther will out | |

Since the long reign of King Stephen intervened between those of the two Henrys, *Henry the First* and *Henry the Second* seems an extremely unlikely title for a play; and as Moseley in 1653 was saving fees by entering two plays as one, it is fairly obvious that he was doing so in the present instance. The inference is supported by the occurrence in Warburton's list of the title, 'Henry ye 1st by Will Shakespear & Rob. Davenport'.³ Before Warburton's time the *Henry the Second* manuscript had evidently become separated from its fellow.

As one speculates about the titles listed above, one's first thought is that *Duke Humphrey* may have been a play in which the best parts of *Henry VI, Parts I and II*, had been salvaged,⁴ and that *Henry the First*, *King Stephen*, and *Henry the Second* may have formed a lost Shakespearean trilogy. The latter theory, however, must be quickly abandoned. It is unlikely that an entire historical trilogy should have been written by Shakespeare and escaped all contemporary mention—by Meres, the editors of the first folio, etc. Furthermore, *Henry the First* has an earlier record which tends to eliminate Shakespeare as co-author. On 10 April 1624 was licensed for acting by the King's Men 'The Historie of Henry the First, written by Dampont'.⁵ This must have been one of the two plays of the 1653 entry. It is true that in 1624 Davenport may have been re-working an older play, but such a play is more likely to have belonged to their rivals than to Shakespeare's company. Pursuing the trail back,

¹ Eyre and Rivington's *Transcript*, I, 429.

² *Ibid.*, II, 271.

³ Brit. Mus. MS. Lansdowne 807. See W. W. Greg, *The Library*, Third Series, II (1911), 230.

⁴ But see below, p. 317 n. 2.

⁵ *Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, ed. Adams, pp. 27-28.

we find that in March 1598 Henslowe paid Drayton, Dekker, and Chettle, on behalf of the Admiral's Men, for 'the famos wares of henry the fyrste & the prynce of wallis', and that even earlier, on 26 May 1597, the Admiral's Men had added to their repertory 'harey the firste life & deth'.¹ It was an old Admiral's play, *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntington*, 1598, by Chettle and Munday, that Davenport used so freely in writing his *King John and Matilda* at about the same time as *Henry the First* was licensed.

Shakespeare's name could have become attached to the manuscript of *Henry the First* merely because it was evident that it was an adaptation of a play dating from Shakespeare's time. Ultimately, as we have seen, the copy of *Henry the First* aided in the baking of those numerous pies which, we trust, shortened the life of the Somerset herald. But what of *Henry the Second*, the companion play, which did not descend to Warburton? The connexion of Shakespeare's name with this play would be purely adventitious. Not so Davenport's. Where identification is possible, we find that when Moseley smuggled into the Register a second play, it was usually by the same author as the first.² *Henry the Second* and another of the Moseley plays by Davenport, *The Politic Queen, or Murder Will Out*, may not be totally lost. In 1693 and 1691, respectively, were published, under peculiar auspices, *Henry the Second, King of England; With The Death of Rosamond. A Tragedy. Acted at the Theatre Royal, By Their Majesties Servants* (which I believe to be a stage version of 'Shakespeare and Davenport's' *Henry the Second*), and *King Edward the Third, With The Fall of Mortimer Earl of March. An Historicall Play, As it is Acted at the Theatre-Royal By their Majesties Servants* (which I believe to be a stage version of Davenport's *The Politic Queen*). No name is attached to the publications except that of the actor, William Mountfort, who signed the dedications. The plays were included in the 1720 edition of Mountfort's works, because the editor believed the actor must have had a share in them, 'otherwise it cannot be supposed he would have taken the Liberty of Writing Dedications to them'—a moderate view of the liberties taken in Mountfort's day! In fairness to the actor we must add that he never claimed authorship, and may have had a hand in fitting the plays to the Restoration stage.

After the creation of the United Company, a surprising number of fellow actors blossomed forth as authors, or at least sponsors, of play

¹ *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. Greg, I, 85, 52.

² The survival of Herbert's licensing records enables us to determine the nature of the double entries in the case of most of the Massinger plays.

books: Thomas Jevon with *The Devil of a Wife*, 1686; James Carlsle with *The Fortune Hunters*, 1689; Joseph Harris with *The Mistakes*, 1691; Cave Underhill with *Win Her and Take Her*, 1691; Joe Haynes with *A Fatal Mistake*, 1692. There were others, the most productive of whom were George Powell and William Mountfort. The phenomenon, I believe, has never been discussed in histories of the Restoration stage, but it almost appears that a new variety of 'benefit' had been devised, wherein a particular actor was to have 'author's rights' to the performance and publication of a particular play, regardless of how he had established possession. Some of the plays are recognizable adaptations; some, at least by Powell and Mountfort, palpably original; while others are of mysterious origin—'presents' by self-abnegating authors who were 'contented with applause'.¹ A jocularity of tone regarding authorship prevails in the prologues and epilogues, suggesting to me that the actors had found a deposit of plays and were working the vein. The group could boast, if not a first-class playwright, at least a first-class writer of dedications. A uniform fluency marks these, all of which are addressed to men who could acknowledge the honour substantially.

Henry the Second and *Edward the Third* were products of the 'movement' sketched above. In the case of the former Mountfort simply signed the dedication, neither claiming nor disclaiming authorship, but in the case of the latter he speaks of the play as a present, and says in his epilogue that

...the Author who did this Prepare
Only expects your Liking for his share.

He may have been referring to an adapter other than himself; otherwise I believe he was being consciously misleading in implying that the author was still alive.

Certain errors about the two plays have been dignified by repetition and must be disposed of first. Halliwell-Phillipps in his *Dictionary* said of *Edward the Third* that '...the plot is from the English history, with comic underplot, and from a novel called "The Countess of Salisbury"'. If this were true, an early date for the play would be precluded. *The Countess of Salisbury; or The Most Noble Order of the Garter. An Historical Novel. In Two Parts. Done out of French by Mr Ferrand Spence* was not published until 1683. But the statement is in total error. *The Countess of Salisbury* has nothing whatever to do with the *Edward the Third* of 1691. The play is concerned with Queen Isabella and Mortimer. Halliwell-

¹ Epilogue to *Win Her and Take Her*, 1691. In the prologue Cave Underhill, signer of the dedication, says, 'You have been kinde to most of our young Actors' and 'The Profits of this Play to me are given'.

Phillipps or his authority must have supposed that it was upon the same theme as the anonymous *Reign of King Edward the Thrd*, 1596, in which case *The Countess of Salisbury* would have been a good guess as to its immediate source. Actually, the materials of the play were old enough to be quite available to Robert Davenport. So also were those of *Henry the Second*. In the case of the latter, one of the sources would have been more likely to be used by Davenport than by any contemporary of Mountfort: 'The Deathe of Faire Rosamond', which first appeared in the 1607 edition of *Strange Histories*. In the ballad Rosamond pleads with King Henry to be taken to the wars:

Nay rather let me, like a Page
your shield and Target beare,
That on my brest the blow may light,
that should annoy you there.
O let me in your Royall Tent
prepare your bed at night....¹

In the play this becomes,

I'll like a Page attend you where you go,
Run by your side, and Watch you Sleeping hours,
And in the Fight I'll always meet your Danger.
I'll step before you as your Fate approaches.²

Henry's refusal in the ballad,

Fair Ladies brooke not bloody warrs,
sweet peace their pleasure breede:

is paralleled by Henry's refusal in the play,

Thy tender Body cannot brook such usage,
As the Necessity of War throws on us.

A stubborn error to deal with is the attribution of *Henry the Second* and *Edward the Third* to the Restoration physician John Bancroft. All works which go beyond Mountfort as author name Bancroft, usually with surprising confidence. The attribution begins with Charles Gildon,³ not the most reliable of authorities, and one who was writing after the death of both Mountfort and Bancroft. We can surmise why Gildon hit upon this particular person. When Mountfort was set upon by Lord Mohun and Captain Hill in 1692, Bancroft was called in to attend him,

¹ *The Works of Thomas Deloney*, ed. F. O. Mann, 1912, p. 299.

² *Henry the Second*, Act IV.

³ *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets*, p. 5. Gildon gives Bancroft only *Henry the Second*. In a note upon Gildon, Thomas Coxeter adds *King Edward the Third*. Coxeter would have been justified because as early as October 1692 *The Gentleman's Journal* calls *Henry the Second* a 'new Play, by the Author of that call'd Edward the Thrd' (cf. A. S. Borgman, *The Life and Death of William Mountfort*, 1935, p. 86 n.), and the two plays are evidently from the same hand. Gildon's giving one of the plays to Bancroft and listing the other as anonymous tends to impeach his knowledge of the authorship of either.

and the physician's testimony figured so largely in the subsequent murder trial that his name was linked thereafter with the actor's. *Henry the Second* was too good a play to have been written by Mountfort, and Bancroft himself had written an excellent tragedy. This, I believe, would have sufficed Gildon. Whether such is the explanation of the error is, after all, immaterial: an error has certainly been made.

The Tragedy of Sertorius was publicly acknowledged by Bancroft in 1679; there is no reason why he should have turned to surreptitious authorship years later. Both in type and style *Sertorius* is poles apart from *Henry the Second* and *Edward the Third*. Its scene division is upon rigid classical principles, and its blank verse severely regular: Bancroft is so meticulous with his decasyllables that he seems sometimes to count them on his fingers. The two historical plays attributed to him have an Elizabethan fluidity of structure, and their blank verse is marked by constant use of half-lines and redundant syllables; occasionally it is, like Davenport's, little more than rhythmic prose. It is not, incidentally, the blank verse of Mountfort. In such an obviously original play as Mountfort's *The Injur'd Lovers*, 1688, the verse is irregular enough, but with the irregularity of sheer ineptitude, as witness

...the Swain whom
She affects is streight made hers;
So they proceed to others in their turn
Continuing Celebrating for three daies.¹

If one were to read Davenport's *King John and Matilda*, Bancroft's *Sertorius*, and Mountfort's *Injur'd Lovers*, then turn to *Henry the Second* and *Edward the Third* without previous knowledge of the date of the two plays, one would instantly select Davenport as author in preference to the other two. One would be amazed to learn that *Sertorius* and *The Injur'd Lovers* were coeval in publication with them, *King John and Matilda* earlier by more than sixty years. That the two plays were something of an apparition in the 'nineties is conceded in their prologues,² and the modern critic is impelled to affirm, 'These two plays are both very Elizabethan in character'.³ I shall quote from *King John and Matilda* and from *Henry the Second* passages where similarity in the situations gives the best opportunity for comparison: King John importunes Matilda—

¹ Act II, Scene 1.

² That of *Henry the Second* appeals to a citizen audience for protection and that of *Edward the Third* asks 'Why mayn't the Antient way of Writing please'.

³ A. Nicoll, *Restoration Drama*, ed. 1928, p. 158.

K. Fair *Matilda*,
 Mistresse of youth and beauty, sweet as a spring,
 And comely as the holy shining Priest
 Deckt in his glorious sacerdotall vestment;
 Yet heare the passions of a love sick Prince,
 And crown thy too too cruel heart with pittie.
Mat. Yet let fall your too too passionate pleadings,
 And crown your royall heart with excellent reason.

K. Hear me.

Mat. The Queen will heare you.

K. Speak but a word that—

Mat. What?

K. That may sound like something
 That may but busie my strong labouring heart
 With hope that thou wilt grant, and every morning
 I will walk forth and watch the early Lark,
 And at her sweetest note I will protest,
Matilda spake a word was like that note.

Mat. Oh how you tempt: remember, pray, your vows
 To my betroth'd Earl *Robert Huntington*;
 Did you not wish, just as the poyson toucht
 His manly heart, if ever you again
 Laid battery to the fair fort of my unvanquish'd
 Vertue, your death might be like his untimely,
 And be poyson'd? Oh take heed, sir,
 Saints stand upon heavens silver battlements
 When Kings make vows, and lay their listening ears
 To Princes Protestations.

K. So did

Matilda swear to live and die a maid,
 At which fair Nature like a snail shrunk back,
 As loath to hear from one so fair, so foul
 A wound: my vow was vain, made without
 Recollection of my reason; and yours, Oh madnesse!
 For *Huntington*, he like a heap
 Of summers dust into his Grave is swept;
 And bad vows still are better broke then kept.

Mat. Alas, great sir! your Queen you cannot make me!
 What is it then instructs your tongue? Oh sir!
 Lust is but loves well languag'd hypocrite.¹

King Henry importunes Rosamond—

King. Why dost thou shun my Love, thou Charming Maid?
 Why turn away thy Eyes, now they've undone me?
 Thou shouldst have hid their killing Fires before:
 Too well thy conscious Soul their Lustre knew,
 Foresaw the Adoration they'd beget;
 Thou shouldst have ever kept 'em from Mankind,
 Or mingl'd Pity with their barb'rous Pow'r.

Rosam. Why will you thus perplex your self and me?
 How often have I begg'd you to desist!
 Methinks the many times I have deny'd,
 Might satisfie you your Attempts are vain.

King. Judge rightly of the Patience of my Love,
 With what a meek untir'd Zeal 't has waited,
 Born all the cold Rebukes of rigid Virtue,
 The harsh Denials of a vigorous Honour,

¹ *King John and Matilda*, ed. Bullen, Act i, Scene 1.

Still creeping up to what I knew would crush me:
 Like the weak Reed against the blust'ring North,
 That nods and crouches to each angry Blast,
 Sinks down o'er-press'd by the insulting Storm;
 Yet still it swells, and slowly strives to rise,
 To be blown down again.

Rosam. Oh! why do you pursue me?

King. Because my Peace has took her flight that way,
 And I must follow through this rugged Road
 To find it out, though every step I tread
 Brings my strict search but nearer to Destruction.

Rosam. No, King, in vain you lay a Siege;
 The Fort's impregnable.

King. You think my Power's the less because I sue,
 Begging that Blessing which I might command.
 How easie might I seize the long'd-for Joy;
 But Force dissolves the sweetness of the Charm.
 Let then my Sufferings urge at last some Hope,
 Let cruel Virtue yield but to a Parley,

Grant my Request, and make thy own Conditions.

Rosam. What can you hope from such a wretched Conquest,
 Where all the Spoil is Infamy and Shame?
 Why would you soil the Glories of your Life,
 In mingling with the Creature you have made?¹

Davenport was something of a belated euphuist: note the word-echoing in the following passage:

1 *Slave.* 'Tis true, though.

Lor. True, villain! are both now seen in the base act?

1 *Slave.* Yes, both.

Lor. Which both?

1 *Slave.* You and I, sir.

Omn. How?

1 *Slave.* Both you and I are seen in the base act,
 Slandering spotless honour; an act so base
 The barbarous Moor would blush at

Phil. D'ye hear him now?

Lor. Out, Slave, wilt thou give ground too? fear works upon 'em.
 Did you not both here swear i'th Senate-chamber
 You saw them both dishonest?

1 *Slave.* Then we swore true, sir,

Lor. I told you 'twas but fear.

Vero. Swore ye true then, sir, when ye swore
 Ye both saw them dishonest?

1 *Slave.* Yes, marry, did we sir:

For we were both two villains when we saw them,
 So we saw them dishonest.²

and in *Henry the Second*:

So we must part; there is no Remedy.

King. 'Tis a sad Truth indeed: Part! 'tis resolv'd!
 Alas, I only came to take my leave,
 But fain I would have parted Friends with thee,
 Because I thought I had no Friend beside.

¹ *Henry the Second*, 1693, Act II, Scene 2.

² *The City-Night-Cap*, ed. Bullen, Act III, Scene 2.

Rosa. And could you think parting would make us Friends?
King. No, but I thought our meeting might.
Rosa. Then why d'y'e talk of parting?
King. I know not what I talk of; any thing, let us but talk.
Rosa. Better be silent, sure, than talk of that.
King. Why must we not then part?
Rosa. Oh never, *Henry*! I can hold no longer!
 Be false, or faithful, I must love thee ever.
 If we must part, be't all upon thy Head!
 For thus I am resolv'd to live or dye¹

At this point the reader may say that, granted the presence of an adapter, the play of 1693 may have been written originally by Davenport, but it may also have been written by some other early dramatist. I must insert the reminder that a manuscript by Davenport called *Henry the Second* disappeared during the Restoration, and that the title of a second such manuscript by Davenport, *The Politic Queen, or Murder Will Out*, exactly fits our second play, *Edward the Third*.

I shall conclude with what must be conceded at least as an interesting coincidence. In 1619 Michael Drayton published his *Poems*, including in the volume *Englands Heroicall Epistles*, the sad avowals of a series of noble and royal lovers. The first in the series are the epistles of Rosamond and King Henry the Second, the second those of King John and Matilda, the third those of Queen Isabella and Mortimer. Here, then, are brought together the themes of *Henry the Second*, 1693, Davenport's *King John and Matilda*, and *Edward the Third*, 1691.² Does it not seem likely that Davenport, acting upon the suggestion of the volume of 1619, embarked upon the creation of a series of neo-chronicles—centring upon the loves of the English kings rather than upon their martial exploits, and more in keeping therefore with the softer texture of the Fletcherian era? The *Heroicall Epistles* are not narratives and cannot be considered as 'sources' of our three plays, but there is other evidence that Davenport was a reader of Drayton. Drayton's *The Legend of Matilda*, also included in the collection of 1619, contains the following stanza:

When all that Race in memorie are set,
 And by their Statues, their Atchievements done,
 Which wonne abroad, and which at home did get,
 From Sonne to Sire, from Sire againe to Sonne,
 Grac'd with the spoyles, that gloriously they wonne:
 O, that of Him, it only should be said,
 This was King John, the Murth'rer of a Maid!³

¹ Act iv

² Possibly Moseley attributed other Davenport plays to Shakespeare. 'Duke Humphrey' may treat the story of Humphrey and Elnor Cobham, which also figures in *Englands Heroicall Epistles*.

³ *The Works of Michael Drayton*, ed. J. W. Hebel, II, 427.

and Davenport's *King John and Matilda* the following passage:

There was the last call; to the King commend me,
And tell him, when in stories he shall stand,
When men shall read the Conquerors great name,
Voluptuous *Rufus*, that unkind brother *Beauclark*,
Comely King *Steven*, *Henry* the Wedlock-breaker,
And Lyon-hearted *Richard*, when they come
Unto his name, with sighs it shall be said,
*Thus was King John—the murderer of a Maid.*¹

A satisfactory parallel surely! Note, too, how in mentioning Henry II Davenport reveals what aspect of this king's career most engages his attention. Davenport is thinking not of Henry the reformer, the opponent of Becket, the conqueror of Ireland, but of *Henry the Wedlock-breaker*—the lover of the Fair Rosamond.

CONCLUSION

I trust that I have not merely evoked what Hume considered the quintessence of scepticism—the opinion that the argument can be neither refuted nor believed. I am fully aware of the speculative nature of my discussion and the inconclusiveness of its parts. I personally believe that Sir Robert Howard's *The Great Favourite* is based upon Ford's (not Henry Shirley's) *The Spanish Duke of Lerma*, that Dryden's *The Wild Gallant* and *The Mistaken Husband* are based upon manuscripts by Brome, that *Henry the Second* and *Edward the Third* are based upon Davenport's (not Shakespeare's) *Henry the Second* and Davenport's *The Politic Queen*. I do not expect others to share fully in my belief. On the other hand, I have a reasonable hope that all will not be dismissed as a product of coincidence and ingenuity, and that my thesis in general will stand.

I have found that, as the hunter for lost Elizabethan plays works through Restoration territory, game seems to spring up on every hand. I am sure that I have left behind better than I have taken. In the present discussion I have confined my illustrations to Restoration plays about the authorship of which there hovered a demonstrable doubt. I have not quite ranged rampant. Individual discoveries, in any case, will never be very important. A play is made no better by our knowledge that it had an Elizabethan basis, although in a few cases the knowledge might quicken us to the fact that the merit is already there. Usually, we shall find only a somewhat spoiled version of a play by a second-rate Elizabethan: we shall discover only the play which Shakespeare did not write.

My theory, even so, may have a certain utility. Future editors may find it helpful in resolving problems in Restoration texts—puzzling little

¹ Act v, Scene 2.

problems like allusions to the Thames being frozen over when nothing of the kind had occurred for forty years. Future critics may justify their statements that a play is 'very Elizabethan in character'. There is always the possibility that the new play has been *written over* an old one, and the erasure of the old play is not complete. The later seventeenth-century drama should be viewed against a wider horizon and with an increased alertness. We need as much light as we can get. Restoration drama cannot be understood without a knowledge of Elizabethan drama; in a measure, the converse may also be true.

ALFRED HARBAGE.

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA.

TWO FOURTEENTH-CENTURY MYSTICAL POEMS

FEW Middle English religious poems of the fourteenth century now remain unpublished, and the two texts presented herewith for the first time should consequently be welcomed as further examples of the lyrical productivity of that century and of the popularity of mystical 'Passion Longing' among the literate devout. The two poems are the sole English contents in the manuscript, a small-sized volume of 136 folios written in England, consisting of half a dozen representative mystical Latin tracts by such devotional authors as Richard Rolle, Bonaventura, St Anselm and [pseudo] St Bernard.¹ Since 1932 the manuscript has been preserved at the Newberry Library in Chicago, MS. Ry 8.²

The first piece is a unique text, 'A Ihū pow sched pi blode',³ a devotion on the Events of the Passion in eighteen eight-line stanzas. The second, 'Ihū swete his pe loue of pe',⁴ provides a new variant of *Iesu dulcis memoria*, previously known in this translation in MSS. Harley 2253 and Hunterian 512, and in related expanded versions in several manuscripts.⁵ Both poems are written in a fourteenth-century hand by the same scribe and consequently share a common orthography, but no attempt has been made to standardize the dialect. The two texts are of different origin and must therefore be considered as individual items.

The scribe was evidently unskilled as well as careless in his transcribing. He corrected one omission in I, 135 by inserting the necessary word (*vs*) in the right-hand margin; but in II, 40 he overlooked the omission of 'bought'⁶ or 'brought'.⁷ 'P' and 'y' are not distinguished,

¹ The contents are described by Seymour de Ricci, *Consensus of Medieval Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, New York 1936, I, 542, as follows.

Ry 8 Devotional treatises. Pseudo S. Bernardus or S. Anselmus, or Hugo or Ricardus de S. Victore, *De Consolencia* (ff. 2r-25v), Hugo de S. Victore, *De arra animae* (ff. 26r-38v), Richard Rolle of Hampole, *Libellus de emendatione vitae sive de regula vivendi* (ff. 39r-66v), Martinus Bracaraensis, *Titulus S. Martini de formula honestae vitae* (ff. 67r-73v); Latin hymn (*Te cele . .*) in 22 lines (f. 74r.); S. Bonaventura or Johannes de Caulibus, *Meditatio de Passione Domini* (ff. 75v-112v.); Poem in English (144 lines) beginning: *A Jesu thow sched thy blode . .* (ff. 112v-115v.), apparently unrecorded; S. Anselmus, Devotional meditations (ff. 116r-134v.); Pseudo S. Bernardus, Hymn *Iesu dulcis memoria*, in English verse (ff. 135r-136v.), 20 stanzas only. Vol. (fourteenth century), 136 ff. (16 × 11 cm.). Written in England. Orig. wooden boards and deerskin.

² My sincere thanks are due to the Directors and Librarian of the Newberry Library for permission to print these texts.

³ Not listed by Carleton Brown, *A register of Middle English religious and didactic verse*, Oxford, 1916, 1920.

⁴ Register No. 1070, the Hunterian 512 text has been printed by Carleton Brown, *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, Oxford, 1924, pp. 111-12.

⁵ Register No. 2074

⁶ *bouzte* (Hunterian, v. 24).

⁷ *brohte* (Harley, v. 24; also Register No. 2074, Royal, v. 148, Vernon, v. 144).

both letters being written exactly alike, generally dotted. The combination 'py' has led in one instance to an error in translation (II, 71-2):

Sou i vnwery þer be
Mak me wery par charite.

Obviously the scribe made an eye-slip copying 'vnworþy' which rightly appears in the other variants.¹

In the second poem there is an idiosyncrasy which deserves special comment: what is certainly an 'o' in the orthography frequently appears for an unaccented obscure vowel usually represented by 'e', generally final: e.g. *blodo*, *fodo*, *godo* (II, 38-40). In the first rime-word of this sequence, *rode* (II, 37), it would seem that the original 'o' was altered to 'e'. Other words which are written with unaccented 'o' include *þo* (unemphatic article, 1, 23, 27, 28), *murwor* (5), *blysfulore* (6), *loco* (15—'look'). In the case of the perfect participles, e.g. *spreðon* (50), it is probable that some indeterminate neutral vowel sound [ʌ] was intended; *greton* (53) and *beton* (55) rime with the infinitives *sweten* (54) and *leten* (56). The phonological spelling of *mowron* (12) and the spelling of the second syllable in *oponuth* (52) strengthen this view. But the remaining 'o' forms—*longo* (21), *scharpo* (28), *louo* (31)—are spellings apparently unique in Middle English.²

Other orthographical characteristics include the use of 'ȝ' for 'p'—*ozur* (II, 18; contrast *oþur*, II, 46), *ȝou* (II, 71—'though'); 'w' for 'y'—*hafwn* (II, 4), *murwor* (II, 5); and O.E. 'hw' twice as 'qw' (but never in the second piece)—*qwit* (I, 37; contrast *whyte*, I, 46; *wyte*, II, 35), *qwa* (I, 28; contrast *wat*, *wen*, I, 108).

Of doubtful significance is the arbitrary use of initial 'h'. It is inserted where not historically justified, and contrariwise is omitted in a few cases. In the first poem only two examples are found in the 144 lines—*heyen* (I, 26) and *is* (I, 53—'his'). Over a dozen examples, however, occur in the eighty lines of the second text—*his* (II, 1), *heun* (II, 3, 80), *houre* (II, 23), and *ast* (II, 24—'hast'), *ardy* (II, 67).³

The dialect of the first and longer poem is consistently Northern. All the significant verb forms are regular—*þou says* (22), *he es* (104), *bes* (3rd pres. s., 132); the present participles *lefand* (21) and *weldand* (23)

¹ Harley, vv. 147-8:

þæt ich þære-to worþi be
make me so worþi þat art so fre.

And so Royal, vv. 279-80, Vernon, vv. 382-3.

² The 'o' forms in the unpublished poem on the 'Leaps of Christ', *Register* No. 172, twenty English lines on a scrap of vellum, are probably due solely to the carelessness of the scribe; but the MS actually reads *betwon* (7; cf. *betwene*, 6), *vchon* (7; cf. *vche*, 17, 18); *Heuon* (11, 13; cf. *Heuenes*, 5); *to rekon* (5).

³ Also: *hyt* (30, 36), *hou* (25), *hascust* (46), *han mus* (50), *heuer e* (76).

rime together with *hande* and *lande*, showing conclusively that Northern was the dialect of the original text. In unaccented words the palatal sibilant spirant is 's'—*sold* (20), *sol* (32), *sal* (129). O.E. *ā* remains unchanged. Examples where the rime scheme indisputably establishes a Northern original include *fase* (24—'foes') riming with the French loan word *place* (20); also the sequences *sare*, *pare*, *bare*, *kare* (73–9), *hare*, *lare*, *are*, *sare* (10–16). In the body of the text examples are very numerous.¹ Note has already been made of O.E. 'hw' appearing as 'qw'; the unpalatized quality is preserved in *swilk* (27, 69), *ilkone* (100). The vocabulary gives additional evidence of Northern dialect, e.g. *hende* (86—Nth pl., O.N. *hendr*), *fase* (24, O.N.), *til* (18, 35, 85, 91), *heþing* (37, Sc. loan word common in Nth), *bowne* (64). The deviations to Midland are few and unimportant: O.E. *ā* not retained, *mo*, *fro*, *go*, *wo* (114–20); *fro* (118); *ilkone* (104) and *one* (110) riming however with *gane* (108).

The dialect of the second piece is Midland. It should not surprise us that the dialect is slightly contaminated, for this text must have had a long transmission. A variant is found in MS. Harley 2253, c. 1310, and as the Harley text is itself a scribe's copy, the poem must have been in circulation for considerably over half a century before it was copied into the Newberry MS. The comparatively few manuscripts preserved, in view of its incorporation into longer poems, are no proof of the poem's lack of popularity,² and it was probably as well known as Richard de Caistre's famous hymn. All verb inflexions show regular Midland forms: *þou zernust* (42), *þou hascust* (46); and *boweth* (51), *oponuth* (52), *makuth* (67) in the third person present indicative tense singular; and in the third person present indicative plural *runnun* (34, 57). The inflexional ending -n also survives in the infinitives *to louen* (25), *sweten* (54), etc.³ The palatal sibilant spirant always appears as 'sch': *schal* (43, 78, 79); O.E. *ā* becomes *ō*; the Midland or Southern palatal glide is of general occurrence—*yeue* (37), *zeldun* (43), *zernust* (44). An indication of a West Midland influence is seen in the universal formation of all plurals with 'us'—*þornus* (27), *naylus* (27), *stremus* (34); and in the verbal endings *makut* (8), *dyudust* (31), *runnun* (34), etc. The iotization in *sparid* (21) is unique and does not necessarily indicate any Northern influence; in the

¹ *hal* (30), *hale* (49), *haly gast* (122), *sare* (16, 42, 84), *ane* (16, 55), *name* (49), *fram* (51), *fra* (98), *na* (53, 80, 124), *wald* (31, 48, 50, 55, 72, 100, etc.). An instance of *ā* derived from the lengthening of O.E. *ā* occurs in *lange* (93) and *sange* (95) which rime with the French *strange* (89).

² It is one of the 'Main corpus of private prayers'. See my article on this subject in *Studies in Philology*, xxxvi, 470.

³ Contrast the Northern form, dropping enclitic -n, in i, 101, *to pay*.

same way the Kentish spelling *seneful* (22) is probably merely intended to indicate a relaxed pronunciation.¹

I

| | |
|--|---------|
| A Ihū þow sched þi blode | f. 112b |
| ffor dred of þyn þ ^u wýst sold be | |
| Of þi body þat is so gode | |
| Mihty merciful ande fre | |
| Þe Iewes in place þar þai stode | |
| Als a thef þan toke þai þe | f. 113a |
| Þow sofred with so mek a mode | |
| It was gret dol on þe to se | |
| Pay spetted in þi faier face | |
| Potted and smat and drew by hare | 10 |
| And harled þe forth þar anna wase | |
| And he þe asked of þi lare | |
| Þow answard lord ful of grace | |
| Aske at þaim has herd it are | |
| ffor þi mek answare in þat place | |
| Pay held þe prowð & ane smat þe sare | |
| Pay drew þe forth by arme & hande | |
| Til þow come by-for chayphas | |
| An oþer mayster of þat lande | |
| And he þe asked in þat place | 20 |
| Ert þou godes son lefand | |
| Þat þow says sothe for he it was | |
| It was þin ansuer al weldand | |
| for soth for fals held þe þi fase | |
| Down on a stol þay þe sete | |
| And hid þin heyen & smat þe fast | f. 113b |
| Wyth swilk wordes þay þe gret | |
| Profetyse now qwa samat þe last | |
| Þaire hetynge fer was nouht to fet | |
| To do þe scham was hal þaire cast | 30 |
| To werk þe wo wald þay nouht let | |
| Me think þai sol haf ben agast | |
| Pay brought þe forth in a mornyng | |
| By-for pilat þat he miht se | |
| He þe sent til herod kyng | |
| Fol for silence held he þe | |
| Cled þe in qwit in þaire heþing | |
| Sent þe ogayn so most it be | |
| Ihū lord of alle thyng | |
| Pilat demede þi body fre | 40 |
| Þan band þay þe by a pelere | |
| With scourges sare þai gan þe smyt | |
| Þi precious blode hath fere & nere | |
| It sprent a-bout wonder tyt | |
| Þi tendre corps þe mayden bare | |
| Þai mad red þat are was whyt | |
| Of turmentes ware þay nought to lere | f. 114a |
| Schourges to mak sarrest wald bitt | |

10 *potted* pushed.

11 *harled* dragged.

29 Their hatred was not far to seek

¹ Compare *pelere*, I, 41.

- Skyn left hale on þe was nane
 Pat men myht se þo þay wald lok 50
 Pay rase þe fleche fram þe bane
 Som of þe scourges þare þay tok
 Was þar na Iw wald mak is mane
 Bot hard w^t dentes þe to-schok
 And greued on þe an by ane
 Nane of þaire pynes þow for-sok

 Pay cled þe lord in *purper* pall
 Of thornes smal þai mad þi coroune
 Kyng in hethyng þay þe call 60
 Þe blod ran owt w^t gret fusoune
 Apon þi scholder let þai fall
 Þe cros and led þe owt of towne
 Despit of þe þaim thowght all
 To do þe pyn þai ware ful bowne

 And led þe forth w^t all þi lade
 On þe lady þay wald nowht let
 And for þaire holes þat þay had made
 To þi fayre hende ware nowht met
 Swylk pyn ihū þ^u a-bade f. 114b
 So hard þai drew þin armes swett 70
 Þat ioynt and lyth y-sonder rade
 Þus wald þou lord oure bales bett

 For þa pynes þou sofred sare
 Þou schrenked opon þe I call
 Þe cros & þe þai left op þare
 And hard agayn doun let it fall
 Thorw hocheng of þi body bare
 Ioynt & lyth departet all
 Ihū þ^u sofred mekell kare
 It semid well þow had na gall 80

 Pan nayled þay þi fayere fete
 Spred þou hanged for manes syn
 Þi moder & saynt Iohā þai grete
 So sare þat nouht myght þai blin
 Aythere till othere sarili lete
 Pat felischep with-owten synne
 With pynes lord þou wald vs bete
 W^t passion oure sawles wyn

 With meruels gret and nwes strange
 Ihū þou swelt on þe rode 90
 Till hell þ^u lyght deueles ymange
 for ferd þat felichep was nere wode
 Deliuerd þaim had ben þare lange
 Adam and other saules gude f. 115a
 To þe Ihū þai mad a sange
 To ioi þai went w^t blethful mode

 Þou ras op-on þe thred day
 Fra ded to lyf Ihū mygthty
 Þou þat all þere myghtes may
 Þi body wald þ^u glorifie 100

65 *lade* burden. 66 The apostrophe to the B. V. is remarkable.77 *hocheng* disabling by.91 MS. *yimange*.92 *ferd* terror.70 *swett* note short *e*.

Mary and opere for to pay
 Pou let þaim son se þe w^t eghe
 Sothly þan may we say
 Risen he es for vs wald dieghe
 Þow spak on-to þi moder dere
 And þin apostels euer ilkone
 And full swetly pou gan þaym lere
 Wat þai sold do wen pou ware gane
 Þe self vn-to þi fader þe bare
 Thre persons and god bot one 110
 Haw mercy opon vs here
 Thorgeh praier of þi derlyng Iohane
 Sythen by-for þi moder swet
 And þi derlyng and other mo
 Opon þe mownt of olyuet
 Pou stegh to heuen & went þam fro
 Alle to-geder þat þai lete
 Þat non fro other wald þai go
 Well pou held þat þ^u us hete f. 115b
 Þus deluerd pou vs of wo 120
 In lyknes of fyere so bryght
 Þe haly gast pou sent þaim sone
 Þan by-com þai clerkes ryght
 By-for na letter cowth vndone
 All langages in þaim lygtht
 Thorgh grace of þe mad son & mone
 Ihū lord ful of myght
 ffor loue of þaim grant me my bone
 Þow sal come to dem vs alle
 And euere to rengne in trinite 130
 Ihū cryst on þe I calle
 A dredful day bes þat to se
 In synne pou lat vs neuer falle
 In all oure bale or bote pou be
 In heuen pou bryng vs to þi halle
 ffor loue of Mari mayden fre
 Marie moder mayden fre
 ffor vs pou pray þi son so gode
 Aposteles all oure help ye be
 ffor his loue was don on rode 140
 In heuen his face þat we may se
 Ihū pou be oure sawles fode
 Ande thynk pou bowght us on þe tre
 Swet Ihū pou swete þi blode

AMEN

II

Ihū swete his þo loue of þe f. 135a
 Non opur þyng so swete may be
 Al þat I may wyt heun se
 To hafwn a swetnes lord to þe
 No song nys murwor
 No no þoth in herte blysfulore
 No no pyment swettur
 No no þyng þat makut me staluyere

- Ihū my loue ihū my lyth
 I wole þe loue and þat is ryth 10
 Do me þe loue wyt al my myth
 And for þe mowron day & nyth
 Ihū do me so to loue þe
 Þat my þout euere on þe be
 Wyt þy suete syth þou loco on me
 Þat i of synne euere be fre
 Ihū þy loue be al my þouth
 Of oȝur þyng rekke me noth
 Bote þe to loue þ^t hast me wroȝth 20
 And dere op-on þe rode I-bouth
 Ihū ful longo þou hast sparid me f. 135b
 A seneful wreche al þat i be
 Þo more I houte to loue þe
 Þat þou wyt me ast beo so fre
 Ihū wel hou I to louen þe
 Þat me schewetȝ þe rodo tre
 Þo croune of þornus þe naylus þre
 Þo scharpo spere þat þoru-stong þe
 Ihū þy loue was ous so fre
 Þat hyt from heuone brouthe þe 30
 for louo þou dyudust on rode for me
 so muche ne hade neuere *man* charyte
 Ihū for þy loue þou dryudust ful wo
 Þat stremus of blod runnun þe fro
 Þy wyte bodi was blyk an blo
 Oure synnus hyt made so weyle-wo
 Ihū for loue þou henge on rode
 For loue þou yeue þyn herte blodo
 Loue þe made oure solus fodo
 Þy loue ous alle to godo 40
 Ihū body & soule þou hast yeue me f. 136a
 Schamly deth þou þoldust for me
 Wat schal I þer-fore zeldun þe
 Þou zernust nout bote loue þe
 Ihū my lord Ihū my kyng
 Þou hascust me non oȝur þyng
 But trewe loue & herte longyng
 And loue terus wyt swet morning
 Ihū of loue is suete toknyng
 Þyn harmus spredon to cleppying 50
 Þyn heuede boweth to kyssyng
 Þy syde oponuth to loue schewyng
 Ihū þy loue þe dude ofte greton
 Loue þe made blod to sweten
 For loue þou were sore beton
 And loue þe made þy lyf to leten
 Ihū fyue wellus runnen fro þe
 Þat loue spryngus to drawn me
 Of red blod þe stremus be
 My soule of sunnus waschen he 60

| | |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| Ihū do me loue þe so | f. 136b |
| Þat were i be or were I go | |
| Lyf ne deth wele ne wo | |
| Neuere my herte torne þe fro | |
| Ihū wat I be wnwren | |
| To loue þe almythy | |
| Þy loue me makuth ardy | |
| To don my saule in þy mercy | |
| Ihū þer-fore by-seche i þe | |
| Þy suete heuene þou grante me | 70 |
| Ȝou I vnwery þer be | |
| Mak me wery <i>par</i> charite | |
| Ihū þy loue ys swete & strong | |
| My lyf þer-on al ys long | |
| Teeche me Ihū of loue a sang | |
| Wyt loue terus heuere a-mang | |
| Ihū mercy þou rewe on me | |
| Wanne schal i lord come to þe | |
| Hou long schal here be | |
| Þere I ne þe may wyt heun se | 80 |

Ihu do me loue scribbled at top of page.

The two poems fall into the group of devotions based on the Passion, which is so numerous at the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth century, and which continued in vogue into the early sixteenth century.¹ While Poem I is a unique text, nevertheless it follows closely what amounts almost to a stereotyped treatment of the Events or the fifteen Articles of Christ's Passion. Consequently there are many verbal parallels and clichés common to similar poems. I have given references to such poems (most of them still unpublished) in the footnotes,² but I make these detailed citations here to bring into prominence the common stock of all these Passion meditations.

I. 41-4

Þan band þay þe by a pelere
 With scourges sare þai gan þe smyt
 Þi precious blode hath fere & nere
 It sprent a-bout wonder tyt

¹ See Arundel 285.

² The progression of events resembles *Register* No. 1040, 'þe XV Articles of Cristes passion', in a general fashion; thus vv. 1-8 = Art. 1; 9-16 = Art. 3; 17-32 = Art. 4; 33-40 = Art. 5; 49-56 = Art. 6. In addition to the verbal parallels noted in the discussion, the following should be observed:

vv. 9-10, compare *Register* No. 1040, v. 81, 'And spytfully thai spytid than/In thy fareast ȝe.'

vv. 35-8, compare *Register* No. 4, vv. 206-10 (Lincoln Cath. text).

vv. 57-8, compare *Register* No. 1072, vv. 33, 36, 'A clop of purpor on þe þei caste/ittynge on þin hedde a crowne of þorne.' Also *Register* No. 1101, vv. 45-6, 'Iesu clad in upil palle/And therto corownd wt egir þorn.'

v. 59, compare No. 1040, v. 62, 'Herode wt hethyng did þe hate.'

vv. 77-8, compare *Register* No. 1040, vv. 110-11, 'And out of lith fersly wt forse/Draw thy ioynte es we onderstand.'

Bodl. 3692, f. 137b, vv. 68–71. *Register* No. 1040, unpublished

Iesu than pai [n]jakit þe
And band þe anne pillar fast
And þe scourgit most bitterlye
Fro hed to fut the blud out brast

Royal 17. C. xvii, f. 97a, vv. 18–20. Unpublished¹

Wen pai w^t scowrges aboute þe zode
Ði fayre body þi sydys longe
Pai gart it streme all on rede blode

Harley 1706, f. 211a, vv. 25–6. *Register* No. 1072 unpublished²

After þi takynge Lord þou were bounde
Vnto a pyloure and scourged fulle sore

Harley 4012, f. 106b, vv. 36–9. *Register* No. 1093, unpublished

First to the piler when they brought þe
W^t cordis thei bounde Thei body faste
W^t shorgis then w^t-outen pite
Thei rentud Thi flesh while ther myght laste

Lincoln Cath. 91, f. 189. *Register* No. 4³

| | |
|--|-----|
| Efturwarde þ ^u was skowreghide sare | 211 |
| And þe blude one ylke a syde downe ranne | 214 |

It might be observed that the form of Poem I is an eight-line stanza, *abababab*, used in other poems of the school of Richard Rolle.⁴

It is very probable, as I have already indicated, that many texts of Poem II have been lost; and I do not think it possible on a purely hypothetical basis to establish the exact relationship between those now extant. The Newberry text stands closest to the form in Harley 2253, for vv. 65–8 of Newberry occur only in Harley (vv. 132–6). But on the other hand many lines are more exactly paralleled by the other texts; thus (Newberry references given first) vv. 13–16 correspond most closely to vv. 33–6 of Hunterian 512; vv. 57–60 to Vernon (vv. 256–9); and vv. 25–8 to Royal (vv. 181–4).⁵ The order of the stanzas in the Newberry version differs from that of Harley and Hunterian, and once again seems due to carelessness by the scribe. After the first two stanzas he proceeds to stanzas 9–12 of the other two texts, and then returns to stanzas 3–8 of the regular order. Evidently he was copying from a book in which stanzas 1–2 appeared on the recto of one folio (f. *1a), and then, turning

¹ Listed in the *Register* as No. 1027, but actually two poems, the first part only (three twelve-line stanzas), a Prayer to Jesus, has been printed by Carleton Brown, *Religious Lyrics of the Fifteenth Century*, Oxford, 1939, pp. 97–8. The second part (eleven eight-line stanzas), a prayer against the deadly sins by the Seven Times Christ shed his Blood, is still unpublished.

² Other MSS. are Longleat 30; and Huntington HM 142, f. 48a, printed by Brown, *ibid.*, pp. 133–5.

³ Horstmann, *Yorkshire writers*, London 1895, 1896, II, 336.

⁴ See *ibid.*, I, 274 ff.

⁵ *Register* No. 2074, Vernon and Royal texts.

the page, he overlooked the verso (f. *1b) and went straight on to the recto of the next page (f. *2a); hence transcribing as his third stanza the ninth stanza of his copy. Realizing at length his error,¹ he turned back (to f. *1b) and copied stanzas 3-8 as stanzas 8-12 of his transcription.² In this connexion a similar scribal error is noted in Brown's collection of fourteenth-century lyrics.³

Though the two poems in the Newberry MS. are quite separate, they have been appropriately placed together for they are closely related in theme and spirit by their common mysticism. They take their place, therefore, along with the two hundred similar poems in Middle English which were written to stimulate meditation on the Passion. Collections of this type, in which Latin devotional tracts are combined with two or three English mystical poems as an integral part of the whole, are not at all frequent. I have only found two other such books, both of the fifteenth century—Bodleian 11272, devotional works by Richard Rolle and others;⁴ and Trinity Cambridge 223, tracts by Bonaventura, etc.⁵ Even collections of English tracts and mystical verse are rare.⁶ The inclusion of these English pieces in this Latin volume only emphasizes further the practical use to which verse was put in the devotional life of the pious reader, religious or lay, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

ROSSELL HOPE ROBBINS.

NEW YORK.

¹ Incidentally, Newberry stanza 7 does not appear in either the Hunterian or the Harley texts, but as stanza 20 (vv. 181-4) of the expanded Royal text (*Register* No. 2074).

² Newberry omits stanza 4 of the Harley-Hunterian version. The remaining stanzas (Newberry references given first) will be found in the Harley MS (references to Horstmann, *op. cit.*, II, 11-24) as follows: vv. 53-6=69-72, 57-60=73-6; 61-4=81-4; 65-8=113-16; 69-72=145-8, 73-6=157-60; 77-80=169-72.

³ Carleton Brown, *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, Oxford, 1924, p. 269.

⁴ Includes, notably, *Register* No. 1075 (A Song of Love to Jesus).

⁵ The two English poems, *Register* Nos. 1058 and 1094, are at the end of the MS. The extract from the *Lay Folkes Catechism* (written as prose) occurs on the fly-leaves

⁶ See, for example, Bodl. 21715, Trinity Camb. 305; Harley 4012.

THE FIRST FRENCH AND ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF SIR THOMAS MORE'S 'UTOPIA'

AN investigation of the editions of the *Utopia* of Sir Thomas More is an exciting subject in itself, but a comparison of the first French and English translations throws remarkable light upon the parallel developments of the two countries in Renaissance literary history. In many respects, the two works may be regarded as vaguely symbolic of the general tendencies of the period, so that even the most casual 'explication de texte' verifies whatever observations one has already been able to make in a comparative study of sixteenth-century literature on the Continent and in England.

In the first place, the history of the *Utopia* begins outside of England, although an Englishman was the author. Thomas More first planned the work as early as 1510 during a diplomatic visit to Antwerp, where he had met Peter Giles, an associate of Erasmus. And it was to his friends on the Continent that More turned when the work was ready for the press. Of the early Latin editions of the *Utopia*, none were published in England until past the middle of the seventeenth century,¹ and by this time there had been more than a dozen editions on the Continent, including Belgium, France, Switzerland, Italy, and Germany. *Editio princeps* of the *Utopia* was printed by Thierry Martin at Louvain, near the end of 1516. This was hastily followed by an edition at Paris in 1517 by Gilles de Gourmont, and a corrected edition at Basle in 1518. Modern scholars have not so far rediscovered a fourth edition at Venice in 1519 by the Juntine Press, nor a fifth at Basle in 1520, although More's contemporaries seem to imply that they knew at least of the existence of these volumes.

However that may be, three to five editions of the *Utopia* during the lifetime of Thomas More (who was executed in 1535) indicate the popularity of the work from the earliest times in scholarly circles. Yet it was not until 1548 that we hear of a translation into a vulgar tongue, and this was not into More's native language but rather into Italian. Two years later the first French translation appeared, and the following year the *Utopia* was translated into English for the first time. Nearly a half century had passed, then, before the work was available in English. Here, as in many other aspects of sixteenth-century literary history, England lagged behind the Continent on the one hand, and on the other threatened to rival her sister cultures in spite of her tardiness. The first English

¹ Oxford, 1663.

translation of the *Utopia* is another example of England's 'belated precocity' in the sixteenth century. At a superficial glance, one can see nothing but its faults. It is only when we examine the two texts more closely that we begin to realize that the defects of the English version can in the end recede into the background through contrast.

There is no reason to believe, by the way, that the English translator made use of the French text. As will be shown below, there are no similarities in phraseology for one thing. Errors are made by Ralph Robynson which might have been corrected had he consulted the interpretation of Jehan Le Blond. But chronologically a comparison of texts would have been impossible. The French work appeared in 1550, and the English in 1551. The English translation must already have been in manuscript by 1550, inasmuch as the preface tells us how a friend of the translator urged him to publish the work which he had originally prepared only for an intimate circle. It is possible that knowledge of the fact that a French translation had appeared urged the English circle around Robynson to rush his work to the press. But even this kind of explanation is only vague speculation.

The French edition of Jehan Le Blond was apparently prepared with a great deal of care. On the title-page, which is arranged with the utmost consideration for bibliophiles, we read:

La description de l'isle d'utopie ou est comprins le miroir des republicques du monde, et l'exemplaire de vie heureuse: redigé par escript en stille Treselegant de grand' haultesse et maiesté par illustre bon et scavant personnage Thomas Morus citoyen de Londre et chancelier d'Angleterre. Avec l'Espistre lminaire composee par Monsieur Budé maistre des requestes du feu Roy Francoys premier de ce nom.

Below this is a little decoration containing the words, 'avec privilege', and beneath appears the printer's name and date of publication:

Les semblables sont à vendre au Palais à Paris au premier pillier de la grand' Salle en la Bouticque de Charles l'Angeher devant la Chappelle de Messieurs les Presidens. 1550.

On the back of the title-page is a letter signed Du Tillet and dated 1549, granting to the printer exclusive sale for the following three years. Then follows a French translation of a letter of Guillaume Budé to Thomas Lupset, English Humanist and friend of More and Erasmus, which had first appeared in the Latin edition of 1517. Then the translator offers some verses of his own composition—'dixain du translateur à la louenge de la saincte vie des Utopiens'—and on the next 'feuillet' (which is the first numbered leaf) is contained a summary of the First Book of the *Utopia*:

Les excellentz propos que tient en Flandres un singulier homme nommé Raphael Hytlodeus, Portugalloys, touchant le bon regime de la republicque: Ensemble le

recit qu'il fit des meurs, Loix, Coustumes & Pollice, Bien ordonnée des habitans d'Utopie, nouvelle Isle, n'a pas long temps trouvée et descouverte. Aussi de la description d'icelle: de laquelle n'avoit faict iamaïs mention aucun Geographe au paravant. Le tout redigé par escript en stile tres elegant de grand haultesse et maesté. Par illustre bon et sçavant personnaige Thomas Morus Citoyen de Londres & Chancelier d'Angleterre. Traduict en langue Francoyse par Maistre Iehan le Blond d'Eureux.

An excellent woodcut at the top of 'feuillet one' shows Hythlodæus talking to More, Giles, and Clement, all dressed like characters from antiquity. On 'feuillet two' is a woodcut of Thomas More in his study, and on the same page the actual narrative begins. There are one hundred and five 'feuillets' for the *Utopia* itself, and the introductory and concluding remarks are collected on unnumbered leaves.

This little octavo volume is a very satisfactory job of printing. Woodcuts appear at the head of each chapter in Book Two, as well as at the head of two letters to the reader from the translator at the end of the narrative. There are twelve woodcuts in all, even though the scene of Thomas More in his study is repeated three times. After the two letters from the translator comes a very complete index of the chapters in the *Utopia*—'S'ensuit la table des chapitres du premier & second livre de la description de l'Isle d'Utopie'—covering nine pages. On the last 'feuillet' is a table of errata—'fautes survenues à l'impression'—listing twenty-five errors. On the reverse side is the printer's coat of arms, which is extremely decorative.

Turning to the English edition of 1551, we find an octavo volume of similar size, but far less impressive to the collector. A nineteenth-century critic has commented: 'This first English edition is neatly printed with a handsome margin... All our lexicographers have omitted to notice it, although it is one of the best specimens extant of our language at the period when it was written.'¹ The statement is quite true, and yet when we compare the English work with the French, the former appears crass and ugly. While the 1550 edition is printed in Roman type, and contains on the whole very few serious errors, the 1551 edition is printed in heavy black medieval letters. Words are run together as often as they are separated, and the capricious spelling of sixteenth-century English adds greater confusion to what is already confusing enough. The edition contains no woodcuts whatsoever, and the decorations seem very cheap and ineffective when we compare them to the coquettish ornaments of the capital letters in the French text, or even in one of the earliest Latin editions. The 'U' in 'upon' of the pre-

¹ T. F. Dibdin, *More's Utopia*, London, 1808, I, clxiii.

fatory epistle is almost childish in contrast to the elaborate 'C' of 'certes' in Budé's epistle. The English edition contains no marginal notes, which had been very copious in the French edition and had appeared in Latin editions from the very beginning. There is no index, no list of errata, and no numbering of pages. Paragraphing is completely ignored, whereas the French edition not only divided the text into paragraphs but also made use of the printer's symbol at each indentation. In the English text, words are so close together that at times one sentence can hardly be separated from another. The period appears for the most part in the middle of a line, and there is often no space left between the last word of one sentence and the first word of the next.

The French had undoubtedly been trying to produce an 'elegant' text: in fact, the words 'très élégant' twice appeared in the passages quoted above. Thomas More himself was mentioned as 'illustre, bon, et sçavant', and the translation, in form as well as in content, seemed to be modelled on this idea. But the English translation, even on its title-page, is characterized by straightforward Anglo-Saxon frankness, without much care for good taste:

A fruteful and pleasaunt worke of the beste state of a publyque weale, and of the newe yle called Utopia: written in Latin by Sir Thomas More knyght, and translated into Englyshe by Raphe Robynson Citizein and Goldsmythe of London, at the procurement and earnest request of George Tadlowe Citizein and Haberdassher of the same Citie.

Imprinted at London by Abraham Vele, dwelling in Paulschurcheyard at the sygne of the Lambe.

The contrast between the two titles is apparent at once. It is not at all surprising to discover that Robynson produces a much sloppier translation than does Le Blond. When, for example, Robynson confuses 'educati' with 'educati' and translates it as 'brought up', we are gratified to find in Le Blond 'on les y mainne'.

Following the title-page appears a letter from the translator to William Cecil, and after this a letter from Thomas More to Peter Giles, which had appeared in all Latin editions of the work. Then follows the text, monotonously compact in form to the end, with nothing else at the conclusion except a repetition of the printer's name and date of publication.

That the English themselves recognized the inadequacies of their version is indisputable, inasmuch as a second edition appeared in 1556: 'newlie perused and corrected and also with divers notes in the margent augmented'. This time the translator is distinguished as 'sometime fellowe of Corpus Christi College in Oxford' instead of as 'citizen and goldsmith', and the folios have been numbered. On the other hand, the

print is not much better, although it is larger, and the paragraphs are still unseparated. No pictures appear, neither in this nor in the third edition of 1597 (printed by Thomas Creede), although they had never been absent from Latin editions. Indeed, as far as format is concerned, none of the three English editions of the *Utopia* in the sixteenth century can be considered serious rivals of the single French translation of 1550.

A comparison of the spelling in the French and English editions gives even greater credit to the French. The 1550 edition contains errors, it is true, even apart from those listed in the errata, particularly in word division, where, for example, 'si dieu eust voulu' becomes two words instead of four. Hesitation between medieval and Renaissance spelling is apparent as well: 'mœurs' keeps its old form 'meurs', 'savant' is written with the sixteenth-century 'ç' after the 's', and 'personnage' may or may not have an 'i' after the 'a'. But the English text disports itself with a kind of capriciousness that is almost incredible. It becomes difficult to understand how Robynson and his contemporaries could speak seriously of 'corrections' in the successive editions when almost any spelling seemed to be acceptable. To find 'Amerike' and 'Amerycke' or 'lytle' and 'lytyll' on the same page are not in the least disturbing after one has witnessed such a phrase as 'their groundes, there ryvers, their cities, theire people, theire manners, their ordenauness, ther laws', a sentence, by the way, which was not 'corrected' in later editions. It would seem that orthography, just like printing, modelled itself upon the English disregard for the order and rule which were fashionable on the Continent.

The French sense of correctness can be observed not only in the care with which the printers prepared their editions, but also in the respect which was shown for the original text. Jehan Le Blond, in his two letters to the reader mentioned above, humbly apologized for any inaccuracies of translation which might be criticized by the fastidious. 'Je lay faict pour rendre les sentences de lauteur plus intelligibles', he writes, and then adds, as further justification for his liberties, that a language is enriched through the possible introduction of new words, without which we will write like 'tabellions & notaires, qui en leurs actes ne changent ne ne muent de stille'.

Ralphe Robynson, on the other hand, admits in his epistle to William Cecil, to whom his translation is dedicated, that More's Latin style was 'eloquent. . . pleasaunt and delectable' and eventually apologizes for his own deficiencies. At the same time he gives evidence of treating Thomas

More rather patronizingly. After a shower of praise upon him in one sentence, Robynson retracts slightly, and observes,

This only I saye; that it is much to be lamented of al, and not only of us English men, that a man of so incomparable witte, of so profounde knowledge, of so absolute learning, and of so fine eloquence was yet neverthelesse so much blinded, rather with obstinacie then with ignoraunce that he could not or rather would not see the shining light of godes holy truthe in certein principal pointes of Christian religion: but did rather chouse to perseuer, and continue in his wilfull and stubborne obstinacie even to the very death.

Such a statement has no direct bearing upon the *Utopia*, and yet it is a far cry from the 'illustre, bon, et sçavant' of Le Blond, who was not concerned with passing judgement upon Thomas More, the man. It is significant, perhaps, that Robynson does not apologize for inaccuracies of renderings, but rather for his lack of skill in writing English:

Nowe I feare greatly that in this my simple translation through my rudenes and ignoraunce in our Englishe tonge all the grace and pleasure of the eloquence, wherwith the matter in Latine is finely set forth may seme to be utterly excluded, and lost.

In other words, Robynson does not question the capabilities of his native tongue, as did Le Blond, or even imply that anything could be desired for its improvement. Rather he regrets that he himself does not know it adequately. It may be noted that in the preface to the second edition of his translation Robynson does not mention More at all. Instead, he concerns himself entirely with his own style, and finally ends by suggesting, with a kind of modesty that seems a trifle threadbare:

though this worke came not from me so fine, so perfecte, and so exact at the first, as surely for my smale lerning it should have done, yf I had then ment the publishing therof in print: yet I trust I have now in this seconde edition taken about it such paines, that verye fewe great faultes and notable errors are in it to be founde.

The tone of these letters dominates in the translations produced. The Frenchman composes a dignified, aristocratic, and refined work, as faithful to the original text as the language will allow. The Englishman, on the contrary, takes all sorts of liberties, leaves out lines on occasion, inserts a few more, and sometimes rearranges an entire sentence to suit himself. Interpolations such as 'God wote' or 'Naye by saynte Marie' are thrown into the Robynson text at the slightest provocation, whereas Le Blond is always restrained and literal. A phrase such as 'horrida atque inculta omnia' becomes, in the version of Le Blond, 'de choses tristes, horribles, sans culture & ordre'. Except for the word 'ordre' (which most of us have come to regard as typically French in any case), the translation would satisfy a meticulous Latin professor. Robynson makes of the same phrase, 'all thynges oute of fasshyon and comylynes', which translates the idea but certainly not the words.

Or again, we may choose a Latin sentence such as the following: 'Bona verba, inquit Petrus, mihi visum est non ut servias regibus, sed ut inservias.' Le Blond translates: 'Voilà de beaux mots (dit Pierre). Certes mon propos n'est pas que tu les serves, ains que tu leur aydes & donnes confort.' But Robynson: 'Nay, god forbedde (quod peter), it is not my mynd that you shoulde be in bondage to kynges, but as a retaynoure to them at youre pleasure.'

In other words, the English sentence is consciously modelled on the Latin, but at the same time kept 'English'. One might say that Le Blond translates and Robynson 'Englishes'. The effect of such thoroughly English sentences, plodding along with all the flourishes of Latin rhetoric, gives a curious impression of verbosity to the English work. A German critic,¹ who has made a study of Robynson's style, analyses these repetitions and tautologies, and suggests that to a sixteenth-century reader this redundancy was undoubtedly regarded as an asset rather than as a liability. Certainly one feels to-day that this kind of Proustian complexity in Robynson's sentence structure was forced for effect, simply because the author liked it, and not because the original demanded it. That which might have made two paragraphs in French would most likely be prolonged into a clumsy and involved sentence in English. For example, such a passage from Le Blond as:

...mais combien la chose est dommageable & pernitieuse, de nourrir telles bestes, France la bien apprens à ses despens.

Les exemples des Rommans, Carthaginois & Siriens & de plusieurs aultres nations....

became in the English version:

...but howe pernycyous and pestylente a thyng it is to maynteyne such bestes, the Frenche men by there owne harmes have learned, and the examples of the Romaines, Carthaginens, Siriens, and of many other contreys....

The two ways in which the translators dealt with a word that was difficult to decipher in the Latin text can be used to exemplify the vices and the virtues of both. Early in Book One occurs a passage which reads: 'Curavit enim atque adeo extorsit ab Americo, ut ipse in his XXIII esset, qui ad fines postremae navigationis in castello relinquebantur.' In the texts which Le Blond and Robynson consulted, 'castello' was written with a capital letter and was taken by both of them to be the name of a city. Le Blond apparently believed 'Castello' to be a misprint for 'Castille' and accordingly made the substitution. In Robynson's text, however, we find: 'For he made suche meanes and shyfte, what

¹ Gustav Gaertner, *Zur Sprache von Ralph Robynsons Übersetzung von Thomas Mores Utopia*, Rostock, 1904.

by intreataunce and what by importune sute, that he gotte lycence of mayster Amerycke (thoughe it were sore agaynst his will) to be one of the XXIII whyche in the ende of the last voyage were lefte in the contrye of Gulike.' The very redundancy of the sentence is noteworthy, but 'the contrye of Gulike' adds a touch that challenges our imagination. Dr Lupton, the first scholar to re-edit the 1516 edition of the *Utopia*, suggests that Robynson may have looked up 'Castellum' in one of the old dictionaries and found that it was the Latin name for *Julich*, the French *Juliers*, sometimes spelled *Gulike*, a town twenty-three miles west of Cologne.¹

One is tempted to say that the interpretation of this passage shows the Anglo-Saxon imagination at work, just as the somewhat baroque prose begotten of simple Latin constructions betrays a similarly proud creativeness and conscious disregard for the original text. While the French translator is devoted to elegance and correctness, the English translator sacrifices accuracy for ingenuity. And the ingenuity of Ralphe Robynson's *Utopia* is the key to its lasting success. With all its faults, the 1551 translation is much more vibrant and scintillating than that of 1550.

It is generally agreed that sixteenth-century literature remained on the whole aristocratic and aloof in France. The *Utopia* of Jehan Le Blond is certainly no exception. It is a work of ultra-refinement, designed to suit the precious tastes of the cultured nobility. The *Utopia* of Ralphe Robynson, on the contrary, is a popular work, bringing the scholarly Latin of Thomas More within the reach of lesser educated bourgeois. The words 'citizen', 'goldsmith', 'knight', and 'haberdasher' on the title-page are addressed, we may say, to the sixteenth-century equivalent of our twentieth-century middle class, and the translation supports the rather unkind statement which has become proverbial on the Continent that England is a land of merchants and shopkeepers. For Robynson certainly impresses the reader with his 'popular' English. The translation is full of the very picturesque and forceful language which was later to find its place in the drama, and which would have no place at all in the accepted literature of France for the next two centuries. It was Le Blond who apologized for any possible vulgarisms in his work, but he was far too elegant to write any. It was Ralphe Robynson who produced them quite naturally, and excused himself, as it were, for not producing more.

What could be more proper, after all, for 'Si consiliariis cum rege quopiam tractantibus...' than 'S'il advient que les conseillers de quel-

¹ Cf. J. Churton Collins, *More's Utopia*, p. 149.

que roy conferent ensemble ..'? It is polished and correct in every sense of the word. But Robynson makes the phrase as English and as colloquial as anything Sir John Falstaff ever said: 'Suppose that some kyng and his counsell were together whettinge their wittes. . .'

The same characteristics can be noted in countless other passages. For example, in the Latin text we read:

Si ostenderem omnes hos conatus bellorum, quibus tot nationes eius causa tumultuantur, quum thesauros eius exhauissent, ac destruxissent populum. . .

This becomes in the French,

Si je remonstrois toutes les entreprises des guerres, pour lesquelles tant de nations estoient en différent à cause de ce roy, tant de thresors evacuez, son pauvre peuple destruit. . .

But the English announces with a gorgeous flourish,

If I should declare unto them, that all this busy preparance to warre, whereby so many nations for hys sake shuld be brought into a troublesome hurley-burley when all hys coffers were emtied, his treasures wasted and his people destroyed. . .

'A troublesome hurley-burley', it must be admitted, has an entirely different effect from 'estoient en différent', or, for that matter, from 'tumultuantur'.

Conversationally, Robynson is at his best. A stilted Latin sentence, translated into French as a kind of dialogue at court, is full of contemporaneous vitality when transformed into English.

Hanc orationem quibus auribus, mi More, putas excipiendam? Profecto non valde promiss inquam,

has a distinctly medieval quality in the original.

Escouterà lon voluntiers ce mien propos à ton advis, mon amy Morus, queres ne presteront l'Oreille à ta harengue, disie,

is excellent Renaissance French. But there is an even greater Renaissance English flavour in,

Thys myne advyse, maister More, how thynke yow it would be harde and taken? So God helpe me not very thankfully (quod I).

An even longer passage may show how limited and restricted the literalness of the French eventually became. While Robynson looked for English equivalents for Latin ideas, and had no scruples against transforming the English itself, Le Blond sacrificed vigour for correctness. Le Blond, in fact, strikes one to-day as a sixteenth-century Victorian, Robynson as a typical Elizabethan. Nowhere does this criticism seem more valid than in the following passages. More writes:

Nam et munistris nobilium, et opificibus, et ipsis propemodum rusticis, et omnibus denique ordinibus, multum est insolentis apparatus in vestibibus, nimis in victu luxus. Iam ganea, lustra, lupanar, et aliud lupanar, tabernae vinariae, ceruisiariae, postremo

tot improbi ludi, alea, charta, fritillus, pila, sphaera, discus, annon haec celeriter exhausta pecunia recta suos mystas mittunt aliquo latrocinatum?

The French translation advances somewhat hesitatingly upon an unpleasant subject, and retreats diplomatically by suggesting rather than stating:

Les serviteurs des gentzhommes, gens de mestier & rustiques quasi, & tous estatz sont superfluz en habitz & en boire & menger.

Davantage on tolere bordeaux, tavernes ou on vend vin & cervoise, puis tant de ieux nuisibles, comme ieux hasardeux, les cartes, le tablier, paulme, la bille, et aultres semblables.

The English translation, however, strives for an effect, which it creates with startling success because of its excellent choice of synonyms:

For not only gently mens servauntes, but also handy craft men: yea and almoste the ploughe men of the country, with all other sortes of people, use muche straunge and provide newe fangleness in their apparrell, and to muche prodigal riotte and sumptuous fare at their table. Nowe bawdes, qweynes, hoores, harlottes, strumpettes, brothelhouses, stewes, and yet an other stewes, wine tavernes, ale houses, and tipling houses, with so many noughty lewde and unlawfull games, as dice, cards, tables, tennys, volles, coytes, do not all thys sende the haunTERS of them streyght a stealyng when theyr money is gone.

In short, the English rendition is a masterpiece of imagination, elaboration, and imagery. A simple Latin expression is expanded, contracted, and twisted, repetition follows upon repetition, adjectives are strung together, and nouns are modified by the piling up of equivalents. What the English translation loses in accuracy and elegance it gains in its inventiveness and its verbal experiments. Whether it was the fact that the appearance of the Book of Common Prayer two years previously had offered new possibilities for expression, or whether the French tendencies towards what was later to develop into seventeenth-century neo-classicism barred stylistic adventurousness will probably never be completely determined. Perhaps both factors played a part. Certainly, the English translation became a notable contribution to sixteenth-century prose, whereas the French work passed away into the annals of antiquarians as 'the first French translation of the *Utopia*'. Only with difficulty can the naive student even discover the translator's name to-day in a non-French country, while Ralph Robinson is mentioned in every history of English literature.

A recent French critic has remarked, with some degree of exasperation:

Pour les éditeurs anglais, tout se passe comme si l'*Utopie* latine était une annexe de la vieille traduction de Ralph Robinson, lequel est un peu leur Amyot. Mais Amyot ne doit faire oublier Plutarque.¹

¹ Marie Delcourt, preface to her edition of the Latin text of the *Utopia*.

Mlle Delcourt is correct. Robynson must not make us forget Thomas More. But it is also true that Thomas More must not let us forget Ralph Robynson. His translation may not be 'great' literature—indeed, there is a tendency among English critics to over-rate its excellence—but it is memorable, and undoubtedly deserves the consideration it has received. The French, since the sixteenth century, have let each new generation retranslate More for them. The English, on the other hand, prefer to add longer and more explanatory footnotes to the translation of 1551, and none of Robynson's successors has ever been able to supplant him.

REED EDWIN PEGGRAM.

PARIS.

DRAYTON AND THE GOODERES

I

THE discovery, by Professor C. J. Sisson, of a deposition of Michael Drayton in the Chancery suit of Engelbert v. Saunders¹ provides (in addition to what is always to be valued, the speaking voice of an Elizabethan poet) confirmation of the date of the poet's birth and some interesting new evidence of his relationship to the family of the Gooderes. All that has hitherto been known relates him to the household of the elder Sir Henry Goodere of Polesworth, whose younger daughter Anne became the 'Idea' of many of his poems. To that 'happy and generous family' he avowed his love and duty, to it he was 'beholding...for the most part of [his] education' and Sir Henry, 'that excellent and matchlesse gentleman', was 'the first cherisher of [his] Muse'. It was evidently a long association. Drayton refers to a dialogue with his 'tutor' when he was 'scarse ten years of age', and says that he observed the mild disposition of Frances Goodere, the elder daughter, 'ever from [her] cradle';² and he witnessed Sir Henry Goodere's will at Polesworth in 1595.³ It is clear that he was adopted into the family at an early age and was brought up, educated and launched upon the world by Sir Henry. Something can be guessed of his movements during that period from what is known of Sir Henry's own adventurous career,⁴ but it has not hitherto been possible to say definitely what Drayton was doing in any given year until he began to publish his poems in 1590/1. Further, the new evidence makes his relationship to Sir Henry somewhat clearer. The deposition, combined with the evidence of other records,⁵ shows that in the winter of 1584/5, and probably for some time before, he was acting as servant to Sir Henry Goodere's brother, Thomas Goodere of South Collingham, Notts.

The suit was brought in 1597 by Thomas Goodere's widow Margaret and her fourth husband Lawrence Engelbert (who was, however, dead at

¹ Public Record Office, C. 24/261/28. See Appendix below.

² Quotations are from the dedications of Drayton's *Matilda* (1594), *Englands Heroicall Epistles* (1597) and from the verse epistle *To Henry Reynolds in The Battaille of Agincourt* (1627). Frances Goodere was born some time before 1571, the year of Anne's birth. Drayton's age is stated on his portrait by William Hole (frontispiece to *Poems* 1619) to have been fifty in 1613.

³ P.C.C. 29-30 Scott.

⁴ See *D.N.B.* (Supplement, 1901) under his nephew, Sir Henry Goodere; F. C. Haws, *The Parish of Monken Hadley* (1880); Oliver Elton, *Michael Drayton* (1905), and the sources referred to in these works. Sir Henry was knighted by Leicester in Holland in 1586, but for convenience he is always referred to here as Sir Henry.

⁵ Such as the Parish registers of South Collingham, which I have examined by the permission of the present Rector, the Reverend G. L. H. Douglas Lane. Only the marriages have been printed (in *Nottinghamshire Parish Registers*, vol. XIX).

the time of Drayton's deposition) against Sir Henry's youngest brother William and Margaret's brother Edmund Saunders. Drayton was sworn on 16 August 1598, and is described as 'Mychaell Drayton of London gent of the age of xxxv yerres or therabts'. He states his knowledge of the complainants and defendants, but his replies to the first six interrogatories show that he was not concerned in the events relating to Thomas Goodere's estate after his death. His positive evidence is to be found in his replies to the seventh and eighth interrogatories, and it is these that involve the relation of two incidents which throw light on his position in the South Collingham household.

The first describes his presence in the sick-room of his master Thomas Goodere during the latter's last illness. According to Drayton, he was called in to give some attendance to the sick man; but Nicholas Moon, another deponent, 'sometimes' clerk to Thomas Goodere and a relative of his wife Margaret, makes it clear that he was required as a witness of what Thomas had to say to his wife concerning the grand lease of Collingham Manor.¹ Moon also adds two further details: that Drayton was called in along with a certain Richard Lee,² and that the incident occurred 'some few dayes' before Thomas Goodere's death. This supplies the date, for Thomas's burial is recorded in the Parish registers of South Collingham on 5 January 1584 (1584/5).³

Both deponents suggest that Drayton had known the Collingham Gooderes for some time; Drayton, by his observation that Thomas called his wife 'as he was wont to do by the name of Gyrle', and Moon, by his evidence that Drayton was called into the chamber by Margaret Goodere in response to her husband's invitation to call for 'some more of those that be thy frendes that thou best lykest of'. This impression is confirmed by the second incident, related by Drayton in response to the eighth interrogatory. Asked what he had heard Sir Henry Goodere say about making Henry Goodere, son of Thomas Goodere, his heir, he recalled a conversation with Sir Henry in the great chamber of Collingham Manor, during which little Henry came running into the room. This incident took place 'vppon a tyme while [Drayton] attended vppon . . . Tho: Goodyere',

¹ See the passage from Moon's deposition quoted below, p. 349 n. 1. I have not succeeded in tracing his relationship to Margaret Goodere. He had evidently been at Collingham for some time, for his marriage to Margaret White is recorded in the South Collingham Parish registers on 9 February 1578.

² The baptisms of five children of Richard Lee are recorded in the South Collingham Parish registers between 1562 and 1576, and his burial in February 1588/9.

³ Thorsby in his additions to Thoroton's *History of Nottinghamshire* said he had seen an old stone with an inscription 'Hic jacet Thoma' which he was told was 'supposed to remember a gentleman who formerly lived in a large mansion in this place'—presumably Thomas Goodere (Ed. 1790, p. 374).

when Sir Henry Goodere 'chanced to be' at Collingham. The date is presumably some time between 1580 (little Henry, who was 'running and playing', was baptized on 10 July 1578) and the time of Thomas's death. The opening phrases show clearly that Drayton's service to Thomas Goodere was of no merely temporary nature during visits of Sir Henry Goodere to South Collingham; Drayton 'attended vppon' Thomas, Sir Henry 'chanced to be' in his brother's house. To Sir Henry he appears as something more than a servant; a relation of friendly confidence is suggested by the words 'walking & discourseng together . . . of matters as y^t pleased him often to doe whersoever [Drayton] Chaunced to mete wth him'. Sir Henry was, one assumes, responsible for placing Drayton in his brother's service; his motive may have been the desire to contribute to the expenses of his brother's household, or he may have felt it advisable to have a trustworthy representative at South Collingham. These are matters of speculation.

II

Since previous writers on the Gooderes have paid no attention to Thomas Goodere, it seems worth while to add here some facts about the South Collingham family. Thomas Goodere, the second son of Francis Goodere of Polesworth and of Ursula, daughter of Ralph Rowlett of St Alban's, was born some time after 1534. He was admitted to the Inner Temple in 1559.¹ His wife Margaret was the elder daughter of Sir Thomas Saunders of Charlwood, Surrey, and of Alice, daughter of Sir Edmund Walsingham (and so cousin of Sir Francis Walsingham).² She is described as being about sixty in 1604.³ Her brother, Edmund Saunders, was born in 1541, and was admitted to the Inner Temple in 1561.⁴ Margaret's first husband was Francis Mering, gentleman, of South Collingham, only son of Francis Mering, esquire, probably of Mering Hall, Girton, a few miles from Collingham. He died in December 1573.⁵ Margaret was a good match for Thomas Goodere, she had 'the fee simple of dyvers Tenements in the Black ffryers London of the valew of lxxx^{li} a yere by estimacon, and a lease of the manor of Collingham . . . for a C yeres or thereabts worth about c^{li} a yere besides dyvers other thinges of

¹ *Students admitted to the Inner Temple 1547-1600* Thomas is referred to in 1604 as having had a chamber in the Inner Temple 'about 30 yeres past', by Sir Henry Cocke, a cousin of the Gooderes (Goodere v. Goodere; see p. 344 note 3, below.) Cocke was admitted in the same year as Thomas.

² *Visitations of Surrey* (Harl. Soc. vol. XLIII).

³ Goodere v. Goodere.

⁴ *Students admitted to the Inner Temple 1547-1600*.

⁵ Parish Registers of South Collingham, and tablet in church.

great valem', according to the memory of Humphrey Stockwith in 1605.¹ The same witness was of the opinion that Thomas Goodere 'should hardly or not at all have compassed and obteyned so great a marriage' had not Sir Henry Goodere made the wealthy widow a jointure of £50 a year 'out of his manor of Polesworth'. (Margaret seems to have made the most of the nuisance value of this jointure for some years after Thomas's death.) Sir Henry, then, bought the heiress for his brother, and they were married probably some time in 1574 or 1575.² They appear to have lived at South Collingham, where the baptisms of their children are recorded as follows: Mary (January 1575/6), Henry (July 1578), Thomas (October 1579, buried November 1579) and Dorothy (April 1582).

The depositions in the suit of *Goodere v. Goodere*³ suggest that Sir Henry conveyed his lands to Thomas and his heirs male at about the time of Thomas's marriage or shortly after, when he, Henry, was dangerously ill; the deed appears to have contained a clause of revocation, and later, at about the time of Thomas's death, Sir Henry conveyed or willed his lands to his own two daughters. The younger, Anne, deposed in 1606 that her father had 'a lyttle before his going into the Lowe Countreyes with the . . . Earle of Leycester' willed his manor of Polesworth to her sister Frances and his manor of Baginton to her. But at various dates he seems to have given hope to the Gooderes of South Collingham that 'little Henr Goodyere' should be his heir. Besides the incident narrated by Drayton⁴ (whose devotion to Sir Henry should make him a credible witness on this point) there are many similar stories. For example, Ralph Cope, a servant at Polesworth, remembered remarking to Sir Henry when the child was two or three years old that he had 'a right Goodyeres face', whereupon Sir Henry said 'I tell thee Cope this is the heire of my land, this is he that must be thy landlord one day if he live'.⁵ Nicholas Moon remembered how at Thomas's burial Sir Henry took the child in his arms and said 'I meane to make him my heire and the upholder of my house'.⁶ The child's mother remembered (together, it is true, with some facts that are contradicted by other deponents) that after Thomas's death, when she was at Islington, Sir Henry sent

¹ *Goodere v. Goodere*. Stockwith was about 67 at the time. He lived at West Stockwith, some 30 miles from South Collingham.

² I can find no record of their marriage.

³ Henry Goodere (son of Thomas Goodere) complainant, against Sir William Goodere and Sir Henry Goodere (son of Sir William) defendants (Public Record Office, C 24/313/38). The interrogatories are missing; the dates of the depositions are 1604-6, and the suit was dismissed on 3 November 1606.

⁴ See below, p. 349.

⁵ *Goodere v. Goodere*.

Engelbert *v.* Saunders.

two of his servants 'whose names as [she] was told were Michell Draytō and one Wylles' to fetch the child from Collingham to Polesworth.¹ She and others² say that young Henry remained at Polesworth, and at school in the country, at Sir Henry's expense, until shortly before Sir Henry's death. Humphrey Stockwith says that some time after 1587 Sir Henry told him that he had assured some of his lands to young Henry and meant to assure others. But Sir Henry's former intentions (possibly modified by Margaret's reluctance to allow him a release of her £50 jointure) were altered at any rate by 1594, when, in the words of Dugdale, 'desiring that his lands might continue to his posterity and name [he] married *Frances* his eldest daughter unto his own brother's son; viz. *Henry Goodere*, son and heir to Sir Will. Goodere then of *Monks Kirby*'³ and conveyed his lands to her. The choice, perhaps, had lain between the two Henrys, and William's son won. Henry, the son of Thomas and Margaret, is not mentioned in Sir Henry's will, but Humphrey Budd, a Staffordshire neighbour, and a witness of the will had 'heard that... Sr Henry Goodyer when he dyed gaue vnto [Henry] one Annuity or penson of xx^{li} ayded out of his landes'. There is indeed much to suggest that relations between the two brothers and their sister-in-law had been strained for some time.

Margaret's widowhood had been brief. She married 'John Price, gentleman' at South Collingham on 9 January 1585/6; she was granted administration of Thomas's estate on 13 October 1586, and of John Price's estate just a year later, on 12 October 1587.⁴ It is not known when she married Lawrence Engelbert, who died in 1598, 'in the precincts of the Black Friars'.⁵ She is perhaps the most vivid figure in the whole affair, a woman of shrewish vigour and resourcefulness. In her own deposition⁶ she recites two long letters received from her second husband thirty or so years before, which were somehow 'conveyed away' at the death of her fourth husband six years before, so that she could 'neuer come by [them]'. They are good letters, telling how angry all the other Gooderes were that Henry had conveyed his lands to Thomas and the boy Harry, and how Sir Henry was sending his little nephew a fustian coat with taffeta sleeves, a taffeta hat, a velvet girdle and gilt

¹ Goodere v. Goodere.

² *Ibid.*, depositions of Thomas Goodere of Newgate St (Sir Henry's cousin and executor) and of Humphrey Stockwith. Cf. Engelbert v. Saunders, deposition of Thomas Griffin.

³ *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, ed. 1730, I, 232; quoted by Elton. This nephew is the well-known Henry, the friend of John Donne.

⁴ Newark Act Book, York Registry.

⁵ Will, P.C.C. 58 Lewyn. Drayton's deposition refers to him as 'lately deceased'.

⁶ Goodere v. Goodere.

dagger; unfortunately, three other deponents state that at the date of the conveyance young Henry was not yet born. But there is something to be said for a woman who was called 'Gyrle' by her husband at the age of forty, and for whom Michael Drayton was one of those 'that be thy frendes that thou best lykest of'.

III

Drayton is sufficiently a 'local poet' for any fresh evidence of his haunts to be valuable to the reader of his poetry. The knowledge that he lived for a time at South Collingham and travelled (perhaps frequently) between that village and Polesworth, some seventy miles distant, confirms the impression of a first-hand knowledge of Nottinghamshire which is given by some of his poems.¹ Collingham is near the Lincolnshire border, and only a mile or two from that 'silver Trent' whose course he so often describes. The Elizabethan village of South Collingham (it is now joined to its neighbour North Collingham) can still be half discerned, half imagined. The thirteenth-century church with the rectory, the manor house (the present building is of later date, but perhaps on the original site), a farm and a few cottages lie just off the road which runs from Gainsborough to Newark, six miles to the south. Drayton's route to Polesworth might be by the Fosse Way, which runs from Newark south-west by the wolds to Leicester and thence to Watling Street; or it might follow the Trent through Nottingham 'the Norths great glorious eye', where 'great hart-harboring Sherwood wildly roves'.² The twenty-sixth song of *Poly-Olbion* surely bears the marks of his affection for all this region.³

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

APPENDIX

From Engelbert v. Saunders (Public Record Office, C 24/261/28).

The Interrogatories and Drayton's depositions are transcribed below. The other deponents were Humphrey Stockwith of West Stockwith, Notts, 59; Nicholas Moon of South Collingham, Notts, 44; Thomas Griffin of Pickleworth, Surrey, 40.

¹ Drayton visited Clifton (four miles from Nottingham) in 1613, according to his *Elegie on Lady Penelope Clifton* (1627), ll. 34-5. He may have been there earlier. If his lost play, *Black Batman of the North* (1598), was written round the same story as William Sampson's *Vow-Breaker* (1636), as is sometimes thought (see pp. 377-8 below), its scene was Clifton.

² *Mortimeriados* (1596), ll. 2157-91; and cf. *Barons Warres* (1603), v, 113-20, 137-44.

³ The gloss runs 'Not a more pleasant Vale in all great Britanne, then Bever' (Belvoir).

The Order on the outside of the documents runs:

Sexto die Junij Anno Regni Jacobi Regis sexto Inter Lauren̄ Englebert & al q
(= quaerentes) Willm Goodyere mil et al deftes

If the defendante shewe no cause for stae of publicacon by this daie sevenight Then publicacon is graunted

which indicates that the taking of evidence was not closed until 13 June 1608 at earliest.

Humfridus Stockwth
Thomas Griffin iuraveru[nt]
10 febr 1597 Tho Legge
Nicol. Moone } iur. 16
Mich: Drayton } Aug 1598
Mat Carew

Interrogatories to be menistred vnto Nicholas
Moone Thomas Gryffine and Humfrey
Stockwith gent. on the parte and behalf of
Lawrence Engelberte and Margaret his wife
Complts Agaynste Edmond Saunder and
Willm Gooder defendt^r.

Imprimis wheth^r doe yo^w know the ptes pl^{ts} and defend^{ts} yea or no

Item were not yo^w at Collinghm in the Countie of Nott wth Edmonde Saunder one of the :
defe at his Syster Margaret^e house there nowe one of the Compl^{ts} in the tyme of her
wydowhood after the deathe of M^r Thomas Goodere her late husbnde yea or no And
yf yo^w were wheth^r were not yo^w [p^{te}1] at the tyme that the said Margaret deliu^{ed}
vnto the defend^{ts} Edmonde Saunder her brother Certaine writtings in truste sayelwe
to be kepte to her vse yea or no and yf yo^w were wheth^r did not yo^w write at that tyme
of the deliu^y of the said writtings this noate Conteyninge the seu^{al} peells of
writtinge so by her to him deliu^{ed} or no

Item what oth^r deedes or writtinge did she the said Margaret deliu^r to the said defend^t
Edmonde Saunder at that tyme w^{ch} are not Conteyned in this paper or writtinge And
yf she the said Margaret did deliu^r any other writtinge or writtinge what were the
same and what were the wordes of the said Edmond at the tyme that he receyvid the
said deed^e or writtings to yo^r nowe remembraunce

Item whate were the wordes w^{ch} S^r Henry Gooder knight vttered vnto the said Edmond
Saunder in the Chappell at the Rolles at the tyme of the hearinge of the Cause then
in Controu^rsye betwixt the now Compl^{te} and the said defend^{ts} Edmonde Saunder
touchinge An Annuite or joynture w^{ch} the said S^r Henry had graunted vnto the said
Margaret one of the now Compl^{ts} Rehearse the same as farforthe as yo^w doe nowe
remember

Item wheth^r did not S^r Henry Goodere Knighte and Willm Gooder one of the nowe
defend^{ts} requeste² yo^w to travell or labore wth there Syster in lawe Margaret the nowe
Compl^{te} in the tyme of her widowhood after the deathe of M^r Price her late husbnde
to have hade her to geve them a release or discharge of and Concerninge suche an
Annuite or Joynture w^{ch} theie the said S^r Henry and willm Goodere stood bounden
vnto the said Edmonde Saunder or no And what other speeches had the said S^r
Henry or willm Goodere or ether of them wth yo^w touchinge the said defend^{ts} righte
therem or touchinge Henry Gooder her sonne declare yo^r knowledge therem

Item wheth^r did not yo^w, Humfrey Stockwth and yo^w Nicholas Moone at the requeste
of of² Margaret the now p^{te} goe to the then dwellinge house of willm Gooder aforesaid
and Camed wth yo^w a noate in writtinge p^ortinge the Contente or pticuarite of
Certaine writtinge w^{ch} were deliu^{ed} vnto the said willm Goodere by Thomas Gooder
his late Brother or no And yf yo^w so did whether did not you leave the said noate
wth the said willm or no and whate other thinge or <...> was geven yo^w in Charge by
the said Margaret to send vnto the said willm Gooder touchinge the said Margaret or
her sonne Henry gooder

Item what were the wordes w^{ch} you hearde Thomas Goodere late husbnde to the
playntyfe speake at the tyme of his deathe concerninge the Conveyaunce made by
him in truste to his brother William Gooder of the graunde lease of the mannor of
Collingham in the County of Nott and the safe keepinge of the same and to whome
have you heard him saye the said graund lease should be redeliued after his death

¹ Present.

² sic.

and whate other thinges have you heard touchinge the said lease declare yo^r knowledge herein and what were the woordes w^{ch} the said Thomas Goodere esquire vsed on his death bedd to you or to any other touchinge the disposing of the lease of the said mannor of Collingham and his other goodes and the makinge of his will declare yo^r whole knowledge heerein

- 8 Item what were the woordes w^{ch} you have heard S^r Henry Goodere saye at Collingham or ellswheie touchinge the assuringe & establishinge of the inheritaunce of his landes and tenements w^{ch} he then was possessed of vppon Henry Goodere sonne and heire vnto Thomas Goodere late husbnde of the now Comp^{lt} and brother vnto the said S^r Henry Gooder w^{ch} Thomas Goodere and Henry his sonne were next heires males vnto the said S^r Henry Goodere and what other matter or thinge materiall doe you knowe touchinge the same to your nowe remembraunce
- 9 Item whether did the said Edmonde Saunder one of the nowe defendaunts at any time aske you any question touchinge or concerninge yo^r knowledge of a Conveyaunce and certen landes that passed betwixte the said Edmonde Saunder S^r Henry Goodere and the nowe defendaunte William Goodere esquire concerninge the blacke friers and an Annuity or Joynture of fyfty poundes a yeere out of the landes of the said S^r Henry Goodere knighte, and what threatninge speeches did the said Edmonde Saunder geve vnto you, yf you should deliu^r your knowledge therein
- 10 Item what writinges or other Evidence did S^r Henry Goodere knighte and William Goodere esquire his brother take out of the studdy of Thomas Goodere their said Brother at Collingham after the decease of the said Thomas to yo^r nowe remembraunce.

[P. S.] xvj Augusti Anno Eliz. 40

p Engelbert

Mychaell Drayton of London gent of the age of xxxv yeres or therabt^e sworne &c.
i Inter That he dyd knowe Lawrence Engelbert named for one of the Compl^{te} latelye deceased and dothe knowe Margaret his late wief now lyving and Edmond Saunder & Willm Goodyere named for the defte

- 2 That he taketh yt to be ment to some other & not to him for that he was not at Collingham in the County of Nottingham wth the sayd Edmond Saunder at his syster margaret^e howse after the deathe of Thomas Goodyere hir late husband as by the artycle ys intended & therfor further cannot depose to that Inter
- 3 That being he was not at Collingham as aforsd he is also ignorant what wrytinge the sd margaret dyd delyver to the sd Edmond Saunder hir brother as also whether she delyvered anye wrytinge or not
- 4 That he was not p^rsent at the hering of anye Cause in Controversye betweene the pl^{te} & the sd Edmond Saunder as ys supposed and therfor Cannot depose to that Inter
- 5 That neither Sir Henry Goodyere knight & willm Goodyere named in this Inter or ether of them dyd request this dept to travell or labor wth the s^d Margaret theyre Sister in lawe in the tyme of hir wydowhode after the deathe of her late¹ husband m^r Pryce for or concerng anye suche Release as ys mencoed in this Inter
- 6 That he thinketh this Inter to be p^rduced for the ptyes therein named thern to answer vnto
- 7 <That this dept being seruant vnto the s^d mr Thomas Goodyere at> the tyme of his deathe was at one tyme in the tyme of the sd mr Goodyeres sycknes whereof he dyed called into the Chamber where he laye syck [*deleted*: wth other one m^r] in the p^rsence of one M^r Mone to geue some attendance to the s^d m^r Goodyere At w^{ch} tyme this dept well rembreth that his sd m^r m^r Tho: Goodyere thoughe very syck yet being in good & pfect memorye to this depte then Judgment (for he sayth he was but young at that tyme) dyd vtter thes or the verye like word^e in effect to his wief calling hir as he was wont to do by the name of Gyrle vidz Gyrle [*deletion*] Concerning my lease of Collingham w^{ch} is in my brother Willm² Goodyeres hand^e I knowe that he will delyver yt thee bak agayne safe for the good of thee & my sonne of whome I knowe he will haue a speciall Care for I dowte not but thou shalt fynd him a verye Just & honest gentleman and I knowe he will not in Conscience deteyne yt from thee w^{ch} lease so

¹ These words are interlined.

² Interlined.

spoken of this dept taketh to be the grand lease of the mannor of Collingham mencoed in this Inter¹

That He well remembreth that vppon a tyme while this dept attended vppon the sd s^r Tho: Goodyere Sir Henrye Goodyere knight named in this Inter chanced to be [there *deleted*] at m^r Tho: Goodyeres howse at Collingham and in a morning the sd Sir Henry & this dept walking & discourseng together [some words inserted and *deleted*] in the great chamber of that house² of matters as y^t pleased him often to doe whersoever this dept Chaunced to mete wth him little henr Goodyere³ the Sonne of the sd m^r Tho: Goodyere came running into⁴ & playing in the sd Chamber and the sd Sir Henry Goodyere then beholding the sd Child vttered vnto this dept thes or like wordē in effect (vidz) Michell this ys a goodlye Child & the heire of my howse

signature Michaell Drayton

and yf yt please good that he & I lyve I will dale well by him, but dyd not declare [P. 9] otherwise or more ptycularly how he would deale well wth him as that he would establish the inheritance of his landē & tenementē to the sd young Henrye Goodyere But this dept sayth that yt was generally [thought *deleted*] spoken during the lyf of the sd M^r Tho Goodyere that his sonne Henrye Goodyere should be Heyre to the sd Sir Henrye Goodyere his unkle and more he Cannot depose to that Inter That to his knoledge & best rembraunce the sd Edmond Sander one of the now defte⁹ dyd not at anye tyme aske this dept anye question tuching his knoledge of anye suche Conveyance as ys specified in this Inter He Cannot depose Nor more &c

10

signature Michaell Drayton

¹ Nicholas Moon's deposition gives Thomas Goodere's words to his wife, as follows: 'wyf thou art here A straunger I know thou has no kinned her but this man meaning this dpt and therefore sd he call for some more of those that be thy frende that thou best lykest of and they [thow *deleted*] shalt heare and be wytnes what I say vnto thee, whereuppon... Margaret called ...Richard Lee and Michaell Drayton.'

² 'in... house' interlined.

³ 'little henr Goodyere' interlined.

⁴ Interlined.

WORDSWORTH AND CHURCH BUILDING; 'AIREY-FORCE VALLEY'

THE eighteen-thirties saw notable activity in church building in Westmorland and Cumberland. For new structures at Keswick, Kendal, Brathay, in the mountains toward Langdale, and elsewhere, contributions were made by the humbler members of the communities, and large sums were donated by certain of the well-to-do. Apparently, the prime support of these enterprises was the expectation, and in several instances the receipt, of very substantial aid from the Church Building Society founded in 1817 largely through the efforts of Joshua Watson, or from the Royal Commission for Church Building established soon thereafter. In 1814, at the age of forty-three years, Watson retired from business 'to devote himself exclusively to works of piety and charity'. Thereafter, as a member of the Commission and as an official of the Building Society and numerous other religious associations, he gave himself, in London and in visitations throughout the country, to the fulfilment of his purpose. From 1822 to 1838 he resided at 6 Park Street, Westminster, in order to be close to the offices concerned. Through William Van Mildert, then rector of St Mary-le-Bow, and from 1826 to his death in 1836 bishop of Durham in whose diocese was the northern Lake District, he made the acquaintance of Christopher Wordsworth, brother of the poet and Master of Trinity, and became closely associated with him in a number of undertakings.

William Wordsworth's animated concern in the church building efforts in the Lake District is evident from the extant letters printed by Knight and de Selincourt.¹ His activity centred in a plan for the establishment at Cockermouth of a second congregation with an appropriate building and endowment. In this undertaking he was actuated by a realization that the accommodation of the existing church was inadequate for the growing population of his birthplace, and by his conviction of the unfitness of its vicar, Mr Fawcett. Perhaps a considerable animus developed from the Evangelical inclinations of Fawcett and his associates.

¹ See E. de Selincourt, *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth, The Later Years*, Oxford, 1939, Nos. 1114, 1149, 1152, 1154, 1156, 1158, 1160, 1167, 1176, 1177, 1178, 1180, 1190, 1195, 1198, 1202, 1204; to Christopher Wordsworth, Nos. 1150, 1187; to Stanger, No. 1157; to Wood, No. 1161; to Talfourd, No. 1162; to Poole, Nos. 1163, 1175, to Kenyon, No. 1185; to Taylor, No. 1191; to Lonsdale, No. 1203,—Wm. Knight, *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, Boston and London, 1907, Nos. 540, 546, 555, and vol. III, p. 430;—E. J. Morley, *Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson with the Wordsworth Circle*, Oxford, 1927, Nos. 170, 171, 172.

If Wordsworth was not an originator he was the champion and principal agent toward the new foundation. From the middle of 1835 to 1837 he was personally canvassing the neighbourhood, arousing interest and soliciting financial aid. The extant letters indicate that his appeals to his friends and acquaintances throughout England must have accorded in number and in urgency with those made by him in the various other causes that he sought to promote. From Lord Lonsdale he secured an endowment of £150 per annum toward the minister's salary. Lady Fleming, John Bolton of Storrs, Benson Harrison, and others of standing in the community contributed substantial sums, and additional pledges confirmed him in the expectation of a total of £600 or £700 from his friends. His letters make it clear that he was in counsel with Joshua Watson throughout the period, and that his correspondent's powerful influence with the building societies was assured.

But the people of Cockermouth were not eager for a new church. To Thomas Poole, in August 1836, Wordsworth wrote that he had unsuccessfully applied for aid to the Earl of Egremont, who was Lord of the Manor of Cockermouth:

He thought it better, in which view he is quite mistaken, to enlarge the old Church and encrease the Endowment. But even to this I fear he is not likely to contribute; as he has just made an offer of two thousand pounds to the Inhabitants, to be disposed of for the benefit of the place in any way which they may approve. Preferring temporal things to spiritual they have chosen to have a new Market place with Buildings etc. This was wanted, and therefore one cannot complain. The other and still higher want will and must be supplied in course of time.

Moreover, a conflict between the Evangelical and the High Church interests that was manifest from the beginning of the undertaking developed rapidly and became intensified by ambitions to control the patronage and the management of the other affairs of the proposed church.

Wordsworth and most of his contributing friends, and Watson and his societies, were of High Church inclination. The opposition, headed by James Stanger, the wealthy son-in-law of the poet's friend William Calvert, favoured control by the board of Trustees that Charles Simcoe, for many years leader of the Evangelicals, had founded for the acquisition of Church patronage and power in Church control. Negotiations by the poet toward compromise failed. Stanger, a generous donor to several churches in the neighbourhood, agreed to give a small contribution toward the erection of the Cockermouth church, but threatened to set up an opposition chapel. In January 1837, 'the Radicals and Ultras of C——', as Wordsworth characterized the Cockermouth party, withdrew their subscriptions.

352 Wordsworth and Church Building: 'Airey-Force Valley'

Promptly, in February, because of 'the *hostility* of the people of C. and their perverse notions of Church matters and not the withdrawal of the subscriptions', Wordsworth declared that he would have no further active part in the enterprise, and would return the moneys and the pledges that he had received: nevertheless, 'if they build and endow, and the patronage be lodged in the *Bishop of the Diocese* (tho' not holding a favourable opinion of such Bps as we are likely to have in future)¹ I would give my own mite, so convinced am I of the spiritual destitution of the place'. Lonsdale immediately withdrew his offer of endowment. Later in the month the poet ended the negotiations with Watson: '...neither on acct of my respect for Ld L., yourself, and the societies, which are so much indebted to your labours, nor above all, of my veneration and love for the genuine Ch. of England, can I attempt to force upon the Inhts of C. a Church of which the present generation at least, appears so unworthy'. In the middle of March he set off with Henry Crabb Robinson on a Continental tour.

For the story of the Cockermouth project we are at present dependent chiefly upon the poet's communications to Watson. Recently I came into possession of a letter of 5 October 1835, by Wordsworth to Watson, in the hand of Mary Wordsworth, but signed by the poet, dealing with Church conditions in the neighbourhood of Cockermouth, and a stage in the proceedings toward the proposed new church earlier than the published letters present. Only a part of the conclusion of this letter has been printed,² and that inaccurately. In addition to its material on the church situation, the letter communicates the poet's own account of the composition of the poem *Airey-Force Valley* that was first printed in the 1842 volume *Poems Chiefly of Early and Late Years*; it contains what is probably the earliest transcript of the piece; it fixes the date, which the editors have failed to establish; and it preserves a verse—the fifth—never printed by Wordsworth.

In the summer and early autumn of 1835, combining Church business with pleasure, Joshua Watson and his daughter Mary Sikes made an extensive tour of Scotland and the English Lake District. The tour of the Lakes followed elaborate directions drawn up for the Watsons by Wordsworth in a letter of 5 September,³ and brought them at its conclusion to Grasmere and Rydal. Family conditions prevented their entertainment

¹ William Van Mildert, bishop of Durham, had died in 1836, and Wordsworth doubted the likelihood of good appointments while the Reform Government, unfriendly to the Church, was in power.

² By Edward Churton, *Memoir of Joshua Watson*, Oxford and London, 1861, II, 46.

³ Mentioned, but not printed, by Churton, *op. cit.*, II, 46.

at Rydal Mount: Sara Hutchinson had died in June; Dorothy Wordsworth was incurably invalided, and the poet's daughter Dora was seriously ill. As the letter printed below shows, Wordsworth himself was in none too good physical state. Nevertheless, he conducted the Watsons on the family's favourite excursion for visitors—over the Kirkstone Pass to Aira Force near the head of Ullswater just above the scene of the *Daffodils*—as through the years he and Dorothy had conducted Scott and Canning and many other celebrities. But pressure of time apparently caused the Watsons to drive on by the road to Troutbeck, and so to miss the usual culmination of the excursion, a visit to Hallsteads on Skelly Nab, the admired estate of John Marshall and his wife Jane Pollard, Dorothy's girlhood confidante and her beloved friend of maturity. Inspired afresh by the little valley and its waterfall that he so dearly loved,¹ and by the enthusiasm of Mary Watson, the poet tramped on alone the three miles past Lyulph's Tower and Gowbarrow Park to the Marshalls', 'booming' the verses that his wife was to take down and later to transcribe into this letter replying to Watson's note of thanks for the poet's attentions.

Rydal Mount Oct^r. 5th²

My dear Sir

What a pity after so pleasant & profitable a journey you should have been attacked with illness on the road—your letter was forwarded to me by Lord Lonsdale, who says 'that if Mr Watson returns to this country at any future time, tell him how glad I should be to have an opportunity of making his acquaintance.' Why did you give yourselves a moment's trouble upon my having to walk 3 miles, & thro' so beautiful a Country?—I was indeed disappointed in having an hour or two less of your company, & not being able to shew you more of the Lake; & especially the view from Mr Marshall's house & ground. It would also have given me much pleasure to have introduced you & Miss W. to that excellent family. You know that they are dissenters & far-gong Reformers; but, Iohn, the second Son, offered no less a sum than £2,800 towards building & endowing a Church to stand in the Town of Keswick—the Parish Ch: as you know being at a distance, & besides too small for the Population; Other Persons residing in the neighbourhood & elsewhere felt the desirableness of having a new Ch: or Chapel, & some were willing to subscribe as much as £600 a piece—but only on condition that each Person so subscribing, should be a Trustee having a voice equivalent to Mr I.M. in the appointment of a Minister: To this he objected, & more particularly as they were all of one Party—commonly called 'the Saints'—he then proposed that he should represent himself as a Trustee—disclaiming all wish to appoint any Relative or Connection of his own—and that the others on their part conjointly elect another—if that Trustee & he could agree in the choice of the Minister, so much the better—if not, they should name *their* Man, and he his, & the decision be left to the Bishop: This proposal they utterly rejected, & yet these men, who are so afraid of

¹ As Myers in his *Wordsworth* remarked, 'Aira Force was one of the spots which the poet best loved to describe as well as to visit.'

² The letter is in Mary Wordsworth's hand, the signature in that of Wordsworth. Page 4, middle fold, bears the address 'Joshua Watson Esq^r/6 Park Street/Westminster' cancelled to 'Rectory Diggeswell/w Welwyn', the post-marks 'A O 7 1835' and 'O 7 O 1835', and 'Kendal/City Post'. Another hand endorses, 'W. Wordsworth Esq 5 Oct^r 1835/with lines/ sent to MSW.'.

the selection of a Bp: under these circumstances, would be shocked if you were to call them Dissenters. Our Ch: alas! swarms with such enemies fostered in her own bosom, & it is to be feared the most dangerous she has to contend with

My Son,¹ the vicar of Brigham will be absent from Workington for a fortnight, having been tempted, by the great Protestant meeting which was to take place in Dublin yesterday to go to that City, which he had never seen—his wife opened the communication which contained your note, but the Papers you allude to, were not in the Packet. Perhaps these may have been sent to Mr Fawcett, who, as Minister of the Ch: of Cockermouth, seems more strictly connected with the business, tho' the Town of C. is part of the Parish of Brigham. It was an agreeable surprize to me that you have moved in this business—thinking as I do, that when particulars are enquired into, it will be found that Cockermouth & its neigghood [*sic*] including the large village of Papcastle, would be much benefitted by the erection of a Ch: towards the lower end of that Town. The Earl of Lonsdale is Lay Rector of Brigham, & having occasion to write to him this morn^g I mentioned the conversation you & I had had together, & the substance of your note to John, which has been forwarded to me by his wife.—

When my Carpet Bag &c reached Hallsteads, I found that a Plaid belonging to some of your Party, had been left, thro' mistake, as mine—I fear you might miss it much—it shall be taken care of, till I have an opportunity of restoring it to you. My walk from Lyulph's Tower to Hallsteads was beguiled by throwing into blank verse a description of the scene which struck Miss Watson & me at the same moment—Here it is

Not a breath of air
Ruffles the bosom of this leafy glen,
From the brook's margin wide around, the trees
Are stedfast as the rocks; the brook itself
Following, in patient solitude a course
Old as the hills that feed it from afar,
Doth rather deepen than disturb the calm
Where all things else are still & motionless.
And yet, even now, a little breeze, perchance
Escaped from boisterous winds that rage without,
Has entered, by the sturdy oaks unfelt;
But to its gentle touch, how sensitive
Is the light ash, that pendant from the brow
Of yon dim Cave, in seeming silence makes
A soft eye-music of slow waving boughs
Powerful almost as vocal harmony
To stay the Wanderer's steps & soothe his thoughts.

I am sorry not to have been able to transcribe these lines for Miss W. with my own hand—but my arm is become so much worse, that I cannot even tie my own neck-cloth.

Our Invalids are much as when you left them. With our united kind & affec regards to yourself & Miss W— begging also to be remembered to Mr & Mrs Norris—I remain my dear Sir, very faithfully your's Wm Wordsworth.

It may be added that the project for a new church at Cockermouth remained in abeyance for some years after the death of Wordsworth in 1850. It was revived in 1863, and Christ Church was erected and opened in July 1864. Many residents of Papcastle Parish as well as of Cockermouth are regular worshippers there.

JOHN EDWIN WELLS.

NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT.

¹ John Wordsworth. Brigham was about two miles from Cockermouth.

DANTE'S THEORY OF LANGUAGE¹

DANTE's views on language and on the Italian vernacular in particular are, of course, to be sought in the first place in his *De Vulgari Eloquentia*. But this fragmentary treatise cannot be fully understood if we leave out of account two other documents in the case. The first is the passage in *La Vita Nuova*, § 25, ll. 21 ff., where he is concerned with justifying the poetic use of the vernacular, maintaining that the *dicitori d'amore in lingua volgare* (who, whether writing in the *lingua d'oco* or the *lingua di sì*, first appeared a century and a half before) are entitled to a bolder and freer use (*maggior licenza*) of the vernacular than the ordinary speaker—in effect, that their metaphorical uses of words are not to be confined to metaphors of every-day speech. In other words, we here find Dante making a distinction between the spoken and the written (literary) vernacular which it is essential to bear in mind when interpreting the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*.

In Chapters v–xiii of Book I of the *Convito* he is concerned to justify the use of the vernacular, rather than Latin, for his commentary. This justification, as such, is not relevant to my purpose, but it is worth noting that it is based upon three considerations:

(1) That Latin would adapt itself less closely and subordinate itself less completely to the object of the commentary—the *Canzoni* (I, v–viii).

(2) The vernacular would be more useful, and useful (that is, intelligible) to the greater number (I, viii–ix).

(3) Dante's overpowering love of his native tongue (I, x).

But I am concerned rather with the features of purely linguistic interest, and in particular with the following:

(a) Dante's clear perception of the mutability of human speech and of the nature of linguistic change. He contrasts the unstable and corruptible nature of the vernacular with the stable and incorruptible nature of Latin and instances the many changes a vernacular undergoes even in the short space of fifty years. He maintains that if the dead could return to their native town after a lapse of 1000 years they would find its language so changed as to appear a completely foreign tongue (I, v).

¹ This article was first read as a paper to the Oxford Dante Society on Tuesday, 8 November 1938.

Page and line references are to the Oxford University Press (1924) edition of the complete works (Moore-Toynbee). For the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* the critical edition of Pio Rajna (Firenze, Le Monnier, 1896) has been used, as well as the same scholar's *Edizione minore* (Firenze, Le Monnier, 1897). Since this paper was written there has appeared a new edition by A. Marigo (Firenze, Le Monnier, 1938).

(b) The vernacular is inadequate to express certain lofty concepts, that is, abstract thoughts (I, v, 84-90). As we know, all the Romance vernaculars inevitably suffered from this deficiency and it had to be made good by very extensive borrowings from Classical and Low Latin before they could rise to the full dignity of literary languages.

(c) Latin is more beautiful in respect of harmony (I, v, 91-104). By this Dante meant that the parts of discourse are in that language arranged according to considerations of art, while the vernacular follows usage. It is probable that the harmony he had in mind was architectural rather than musical, but I would go beyond this and say that he had a perception of the more fundamental distinction between a language (Latin) in which the demands of logic are much more fully met and a language (vernacular) in which current usage has the last word. It is a contrast between the trained and the untrained. It is therefore not surprising that Dante should describe Latin, considered from this point of view, as the nobler language (I, v, 106). At the same time I see nothing contradictory in his describing the vernacular as the nobler when considered from another point of view and in an entirely different context, viz. in *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, I, i, 35, where its claim is based upon the fact that it is the natural and universal medium. It is surely permissible to vaunt the nobility of the savage, even before Jean-Jacques Rousseau, without implying that he is in every respect and on all occasions nobler than the cultured man.

There are two ideas in particular that may be said to inspire Dante's remarks in the *Vita Nuova* and in the *Convito*. One is his ardent love of his mother tongue and the desire to vindicate the claims of the *lingua di sì*, especially against the exaggerated and monopolistic pretensions of the *lingua d'oco* (*Conv.* I, x, 74-9). The other is the clearly expressed desire of Dante to stabilize his beloved vernacular in poetry and thus to confer upon it some of that special kind of nobility which he felt Latin to possess (*Conv.* I, xiii, 45-58). His aim is not to create a *vulgare illustre*, but to refine, stabilize and consecrate its use in poetry. It seems to me essential to keep these two ideas in mind if we are to interpret correctly the thesis expounded in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*.

In attempting to assess the value of this treatise and of Dante as a philologist the first question to be faced is that of his originality. His originality is not complete and absolute, as he himself confesses in the first chapter (I, 15). To judge from the opening lines¹ of Chapter ix of

¹ Nos autem nunc oportet quam habemus rationem periclitari, cum inquirere intendamus de his in quibus nullius auctoritate fulcimur, hoc est de unius eisdemque a principio ydionatis variatione secuta.

Book I, Dante would appear to lay little claim to originality for the first eight chapters and to acknowledge no authority for what follows. But it would be rash to make a rigid distinction and to assume that what precedes is entirely derivative and what follows is entirely original. To begin with, the plan of the work bears a general but definite resemblance to that of the *Razos de trobar*¹ of Raimon Vidal with its general introduction consisting of a defence of *lemosí* and an attempt to define its position *vis-à-vis* other Romance idioms, followed by a descriptive grammatical analysis of the language of the troubadours. Quite apart from the further evidence of certain resemblances in detail,² it is improbable—one might say impossible—that Dante should have remained in ignorance of Raimon Vidal's work. In fact, the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* is to my mind to be described not as a vindication of the vulgar tongue against Latin, but rather as a challenge issued on behalf of the Italian vernacular against the rather exclusive claims made for Provençal by such writers as Raimon Vidal. Nor could Dante have failed to take cognizance of the *Donatz proensals*³ and other didactic works of a grammatical or literary nature inspired by the poetry of the troubadours—including those which have not come down to us but were presumably exploited by the compilers of the fourteenth-century *Leys d'Amors*.⁴ To these he may have been indebted in such matters as the analysis of the *canzone* which he undertakes in Book II. It has further been shown by Dr Chaytor⁵ that some of the puzzling epithets (*pexus*, *irsutus*, *lubricus*, etc.) employed by Dante were conventional in medieval literary criticism and there can be little doubt that Dante was acquainted with one or more of the thirteenth-century *Artes Poeticae*.⁶ But none of these sources could be said to have done much more than inspire Dante and help him to sketch the broad lines of his project. His statement that he is supported by the authority of none certainly holds for the most striking, intriguing and, we may say, epoch-making portion of his treatise, chapters ix-xix of Book I.

¹ Edited by E. Stengel, *Die beiden ältesten provenzalischen Grammatiken*, pp. 67-91. The *Razos de trobar* dates from the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century. In the MSS. it is followed by a short Provençal-Italian glossary. A short verse rendering of the *Razos* composed by the Italian troubadour Terramagnino of Pisa (end of thirteenth century) was published by P. Meyer in *Romania*, VIII, 184.

² Compare *Razos* 70, 30 ff. and *V.E.* I, x, 11 ff.

³ Edition in Stengel, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-66. The *Donatz* was composed in Italy for two Italian noblemen (c. 1240). A Latin version is preserved as well as the Provençal. It was certainly known to the compilers of the *Leys d'Amors*.

⁴ Cf. *Las Leys d'Amors*, ed. J. Anglade, vol. IV (Bibl. Mérid. I, 17-20), Toulouse, 1919-20.

⁵ In *Mod. Lang. Rev.* XXIV (1929), 205-6, cf. W. P. Ker in *Mod. Lang. Rev.* IV (1909), 145 ff.

⁶ Texts in E. Faral, *Les Arts Poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècle*, Paris, Champion, 1924.

As for the authorities he alludes to in the opening chapter (I, I, 15), it seems impossible to identify them specifically. From them he undoubtedly took over his ideas on the origin of speech and its nature, together with the traditional account of the confusion of tongues and the diversification of speech.

These ideas are briefly that speech was first given to Adam, but not to angels or lower animals, for whom it was not necessary; nor did God use human speech. Adam first spoke in Paradise and spoke a certain form of speech which was created by God together with the first soul—a form, says Dante, both in respect of the names of things and of the grammatical constructions of these names and of the utterance. This was the Hebrew language (*ydioma sacratum, antiquissima locutio*). The confusion of tongues (Babel) resulted in diversification: only the descendants of Shem, having been absent from the building, continued to speak the holy language. The dispersion of peoples followed. Those who came to Europe, whether strangers or returned natives, brought with them a three-fold speech: (1) Eastern Europe—Greek (with later derivatives); (2) Northern Europe—‘jo’ language (with later diversifications and derivatives); (3) Southern Europe—Romance tongue (*ydioma tripharvum*), now appearing in three-fold form: *lingua ‘oc’*, *lingua ‘oil’*, *lingua ‘si’*.

I can find no source for the account of the diversification of tongues in Europe here given by Dante (I, viii, 13–64), nor for this first contribution to the science of Romance philology, small but none the less striking at this early date. On the other hand, the ideas on the origin of speech, its nature and subsequent first diversification are to be found with variations in patristic writers. They base themselves in the main upon Genesis and consider language as a direct gift of God, though they are also influenced by Platonic, Epicurean and Stoic ideas. Their views had currency in Genesis commentaries down to the time of Thomas Aquinas and they are roughly to the effect that Man alone is a creature of reason and therefore alone possesses language, that he named the animals according to his pleasure but with insight into their nature, etc. But he did not name them all at once (e.g. not fishes). Other names were added and old ones changed in the course of time. God did not speak with human speech, and neither did the Serpent, who was merely a mouthpiece. Hebrew was the original language. The confusion of tongues is not to be explained as diversification or change of language in our sense of the term. The commentators explain it, not as a new creation but as a reshuffling of letters and sounds by God and the attribution of new meanings to old words—thus ensuring a mutual lack of comprehension.

Other linguistico-philosophical developments and variations arose from commentaries on the Gospel of St John, and still others go back to commentaries on Aristotle and to grammatical and rhetorical treatises.

Most of these ideas, and particularly those of the patristic writers, were taken up and synthetized (though not perfectly) by Thomas Aquinas, whose linguistic philosophy has to be pieced together from his more or less scattered observations on the subject.¹ Keeping to what is here relevant, we find that he follows the patristic writers in holding that Man alone, being a creature of reason, can speak, that it was the Devil who spoke through the Serpent, and that animals, when they are said to speak, are merely mouthpieces. As to the origin of language, St Thomas seems to hesitate between two views, and this is, I think, the significant feature. He indicates incidentally (when he describes God's intervention at Babel) that man received language as an express gift of God, but he develops more at length the theory that language was invented by man and that Adam himself named things and formed derivatives (not only by formal derivation, but by composition and analogical extension). Yet Adam may have received the names of the 'first' things from God. St Thomas seems to have inclined, therefore, to the theory of the *natural* invention of language, holding that Man used the raw material (vocal sounds, etc.) placed at his disposal, consciously and purposely, for the constitution of a language. The individual elements of language are conventional signs: hence the possibility of dialect variations and diversification of language. His view would therefore seem to have been roughly that God gave Adam language 'potentially' or 'virtually', i.e. he gave him the power to invent language himself, but this view is not expressly stated by him. In a word, St Thomas does not synthetize the two views.

If we turn now to Dante, we find a very similar hesitation, reflected first of all in the fact that in *Paradiso*, Canto xxvi, 124 ff. he makes Adam speak as though even before the confusion of tongues the language was changing and had died out or degenerated, while in *De Vulgari*, I, vi, it is said that the language spoken by Adam was used by all his descendants till the building of Babel. Then again, within the treatise itself there is the contradiction between the traditional view and the 'naturalistic' conception of language (cf. I, ix), just as in St Thomas.

I think we may therefore conclude that, whatever Dante may have taken incidentally from other sources, the first seven chapters and the beginning of the eighth probably derive in the main from St Thomas.

When we come to the description of the linguistic condition of Italy,

¹ Cf. F. Munthey, *Die Sprachphilosophie des hl. Thomas von Aquin*, Paderborn, 1937.

the search for the *vulgare illustre*, and the remarks on its use for literary purposes, we have to do with a series of original observations and deductions which reveal Dante as a philologist entitled to a fuller tribute than he has yet received. There has, it is true, been no lack of commendation, but it has generally been tempered by mild and sometimes patronizing criticism. His classification of Italian dialects has been criticized in this or that particular, or the validity of his criteria has been questioned. It has also been suggested that he was somehow unaware, or disingenuously simulated an unawareness, of the identity of his own language with the *vulgare illustre*.¹ Alternatively, too much has been made of certain apparent contradictions in Dante, and others have been read into his treatise. In other words he has been praised, well but not always wisely.

The failure to do full justice to Dante the philologist is due partly to the fact that most critics have approached the problem of the *vulgare illustre* via the vexed language controversy² and have allowed the decisive influence exerted by Dante on the later fortunes of the Italian language to obscure or colour their interpretation of his remarks on the linguistic condition of Italy at his time and on the relation between the language of literature and the speech of every-day life. Then again, modern critics have tended to interpret him in the light of this or that linguistic theory or preoccupation of the moment, and we find a scholar like Bertoni abandoning a former sound (if partial) interpretation³ in favour of one which adopts without reserve the theory of the 'parler directeur'.⁴ Finally we have that peculiar form of pedantry which can only be called the perversity of erudition. This can be illustrated from Pio Rajna's commentary on the first chapter of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*.⁵ I hope I shall not be considered wanting in respect for his precise scholarship if I question the necessity of proving at some length that, when Dante speaks of *hydromellum*, he could not have had in mind the hydromel of the ancients, a fermented beverage for which the epithet '*dulcissimum*' is inappropriate, etc. Such digressions do little harm, except in so far as they obscure real issues; but this sort of approach becomes definitely unjust to Dante when it takes the form of setting up a rigid definition of *eloquentia* based largely upon extraneous considerations. Rajna rejects Fontanini's interpretation *eloquentia* = 'speech' and accepts the single interpretation 'eloquence', implying that Dante is concerned solely with

¹ G. Bertoni in *Arch. Rom.* xx, 91-102.

² Cf. Thérèse Labande-Jeanroy, *La Question de la Langue en Italie*, Paris, Istra, 1925.

³ *Il Duecento*, Milan, Vallardi, 1910, pp. 73 ff.

⁴ *Arch. Rom.*, xx, 98.

⁵ Published in *Miscellanea di Studi in onore di Attilio Hortis*, Trieste, 1910, pp. 113-28.

the use of the vernacular as a literary instrument. He is then forced to suppose that Dante knew neither the *Razos de trobar* of Raimon Vidal nor the *Donatz proensals* and that he must have added *quicquam* (l. 2) in a moment of inattention, without reflecting. And he is further led to explain the apparent contradiction between *Convito*, I, v, 104 and *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, I, as due to the fact that the former refers to the Italian vernacular, while the latter refers to language in general.

Now it is clearly essential that we should satisfy ourselves as to the meanings attributed by Dante to the technical or semi-technical terms (*eloquentia*, *loquela*, etc.), but this should be done, not by asking ourselves: Does *eloquentia* mean 'speech' or does it mean 'eloquence'? We should rather examine all the examples of its use in the treatise and see what meaning or meanings the word has in each context. We may thus find that he does not use it in one of the two senses, but in both. I have tried to study in this way each of the terms used by Dante in his treatise. Statistical methods prove nothing in such a matter, and I therefore refrain from reproducing my concordance in this paper, but my observations may be summed up as follows.¹

Eloquentia is employed by Dante in respect of 'speech' in the opening lines, and it seems to me perverse to give it any other meaning here in view of the rest of the sentence, where it is said explicitly '*cum . . . talem eloquentiam penitus omnibus necessarium videamus.*' Similarly in I, xix, 22. In I, xi, 11, it may mean 'ordinary speech' or 'refined speech', but not 'eloquence' in the special sense. The latter meaning is however clearly intended in I, xv, 11 (*tantus eloquentie vir existens*).²

To denote language or varieties of it Dante uses:

Lingua in the sense of 'tongue' or 'language' (spoken or general)--*confusio linguarum*, *lingua vulgaris*, *lingua d'oïl*, *lingua sicularum*, etc. *Linguae* is used in respect of diverse varieties of speech and specifically in reference to the dialects of Italy (e.g. I, x, 61).

Loquela in reference to language or a particular form of language, language used for poetry (I, x, 24), patois, varieties of Tuscan (I, xiii, 41), and on one occasion: *illustris loquela* = 'spoken Italian' (I, xi, 3).

Locutio in reference to statement, observation, utterance, form of speech, language (e.g. the language of the right side of Italy, I, ix, 34) or human speech. We may note also *materna l.*, *antiquissima l.* (Hebrew),

¹ I employ the word 'meaning' in the sense of 'use' rather than 'definition', preferring to say, for example, that *linguae* is used upon occasion to denote dialects rather than that *linguae* = 'dialects'.

² Cf. also *vulgares eloquentes* 'those speaking a vernacular' (I, x, 22) and *eloquentes* 'those who speak or write well' (I, xii, 73).

and *l. secundaria* (Latin), to which is opposed the *l. vulgaris* (vernacular) described as *nobilior* (I, i, 41).

Sermo in reference to speech or local speech; cf. *varietates sermonum* 'varieties of speech', 'local dialects' (I, ix, 45).

Ydionia in reference to a particular form of speech (e g. our own), the root Romance language or its present threefold form (*ydionia tripharium*), the language of Adam, etc.

Grammatica is the term applied to Latin or to other literary languages, which by the very fact that they are stabilized are to some extent fixed or dead; it also denotes Latin grammar or formal grammar in general (I, ix, 94-107).

But the crucial term is *vulgare*, particularly when accompanied by the epithet *illustre*. *Vulgare* denotes in the first place the speech of the common man; thence, in opposition to the learned idiom (*grammatica*) it is used in reference to the vernacular in the general sense, in the sense of 'spoken language', or in the sense of 'written language'. *Vulgare illustre* is the term applied to standard (or 'correct') Italian, both literary and spoken (I, xvii, 27-33, etc.)¹; but is also used in a more special sense to denote the higher, nobler or more distinguished form of language used for tragedy or the higher style (II, iv, 41-4). Similarly *vulgare aulicum* is used to denote standard Italian, whether spoken or written. The same applies to the epithets *curiale* and *cardinale* (I, xviii, 33 ff.); and *curiale* is specifically contrasted with *municipale* (I, xiii, 12).

These observations make it quite clear that Dante uses his terms loosely, without attributing to each linguistic term a meaning capable of being formulated in a single definition. And it could not have been otherwise, unless he had created a technical vocabulary of his own, such as modern writers on linguistic theory are constrained to manufacture. For him *vulgare* is the vernacular in all its forms, spoken, written, dialectal, standard; if he wishes to specify a particular kind of vernacular he employs various epithets, standard *vulgare* being designated preferably by *illustre*, but also by *aulicum*, *curiale* and *cardinale*, to distinguish the more select, authoritative, standard usage from the local varieties, and it is difficult to think of more suitable epithets for the purpose.

When Dante comes finally to distinguish varieties of literary Italian he employs epithets to correspond with differences of caste, or rather of tone. The type suitable to the highest form of literature is described as

¹ Hoc nempe videtur esse id de quo loquimur vulgare; et hinc est quod in regis omnibus conversantes semper illustri vulgari locuntur. Hinc etiam est quod nostrum illustre velut acola peregrinatur et in humilibus hospitatur asilis, cum aula vacemus (I, xviii, 27-33).

illustre in the more restricted or special sense (i.e. *illustre* as compared with the style required for Comedy and lower types), *nobilissimum*, etc.

I would therefore maintain that, at least in Dante's opinion, there existed a standard *spoken* Italian (employed, it may be, by a very restricted part of the population) which was different from every local form, including Tuscan and its sub-variety Florentine; that it was most nearly approached by the usage of Bologna, that it had been employed by a few writers, though not always impeccably even by them; and that it was this language that should be employed in literature. This interpretation runs counter to what has come to be an orthodox view of the matter, namely that there was no standard spoken language of any sort, that there was at most a vague, remote ideal in the minds of certain writers, and that Dante was not speaking in terms of reality. Thus, Bertoni (in *Arch. Rom.*, xx, 91) maintains that Dante was in reality defending his own personal language, the language which was *later* to become standard Italian, and this view fits in with the general linguistic picture hitherto accepted as accurate. It is a picture of pre-Dantean Italy linguistically divided into dialectal compartments, more or less hermetically sealed, such vernacular literature as there was being purely dialectal. This view I believe to be not only at variance with what such an incomparable guide as Dante tells us, but contrary to evidence and common sense, so much so that it seems incumbent upon the exponents of this view to prove that the contrary was not possible. And they have in fact advanced various arguments, the chief being the lack of political unity and intercommunication. It is of course granted that the mass of the population remained unaffected by such intercourse as there was and that for them there can be no question of a common standard tongue before Dante, or for that matter after Dante. But for a considerable section of the population, and that the most influential in matters of linguistic standard or fashion, the picture is not, I believe, a faithful one. It yet remains for the historian to give us a complete account of the very considerable movements inspired by intercommunal and interprovincial interests, financial, political, ecclesiastical, and cultural in the widest sense.¹ He might show us a thirteenth century (and to some extent a twelfth century) in which the disruption of the feudal hierarchy and the growth of communal activities, the rise of laymen and of the middle class, and other factors induced horizontal divisions (cutting right across the population) as against older vertical divisions. Spiritual forces could be shown

¹ In the meantime reference may be made to G. Bertoni, *Il Duecento*, particularly pp. 72-3, 243 ff.; and G. Bertoni, *Lingua e Pensiero*, Florence, Olschki, cc. II-III.

overleaping regional boundaries: the spread of heresies, processions of Flagellanti, the use of the vulgar tongue by St Francis, the opening of lay schools no doubt contributed to the development of a standard tongue. Universities and other centres of culture, of commerce, etc., undoubtedly served as focal points: Bologna, Florence, Lucca, Arezzo; not to mention the Court of Frederick II and Manfred, both of them to some extent peripatetic. Not the least interesting passage in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (I, xv, 14-33) is that in which Dante describes the consequences of the impact of neighbouring dialects on that of Bologna (I, xv, 15 ff.) This description, though expressed in terms which the modern philologist might call unscientific, carries conviction; and between languages there cannot be impact without intercourse.

All these factors would tend to create a measure of standardization within a limited sphere, for standardization results by a natural process from community of interests, of whatever kind, requiring the use of language.¹ The uniformity of architecture in different parts of the peninsula may perhaps be regarded as symptomatic.

It was this roughly standard form of Italian, resulting naturally and inevitably from intercourse, that the 'Sicilian' poets, whether natives of Sicily or not, employed. It was an imperfect standardization, no doubt, and therefore not entirely devoid of dialectal features. It is upon these dialectal features that philologists have always fastened with a greedy enthusiasm amounting to perversity. It is surely time that we approached these early texts, not backwards from the nineteenth or twentieth century, but forward from an earlier period, lest we join those persons stigmatized by Dante—'qui tanquam caeci ambulant per plateas, plerumque anteriora posteriora putantes'. What is remarkable about these early literary texts—and this applies equally to early literary texts in other languages, such as French and Spanish²—is not the existence of a few dialectal traits, but the remarkable degree of standardization achieved.³

The fact that the poets of the Sicilian school present so few dialectal

¹ Standardization is inherent in speech and may be said to exist as soon as two individuals use a common language. It is essentially a social factor and one of its effects is that one and the same person may belong to several linguistic groups, one within the other. Unless his interests and activities are confined to his local group he will inevitably adopt the standard of the larger group, but he will not necessarily abandon the usage of his local group; in other words, he may be in a sense bilingual or even trilingual.

² Cf. the *Sequence of Eulalia*, *Alexis*, *Roland*; *Cantar de Mio Cid*.

³ There are, of course, early monuments in these various languages which are properly 'dialectal'. They are texts of a documentary or practical character (charters, private contracts, *Libro di Banchieri fiorentini*, etc.), or they are works written for a limited public (*laude*), etc. The obscurity of the *Ritmo Cassinese* and the *Cantilena Giullaresca* shows what happens if a dialectal or non-standard medium is employed.

traits that can be described as specifically Sicilian, far from being envisaged in the way I have suggested, has been treated as an awkward fact to be explained away, and it has been neatly eliminated by propounding the theory of the Tuscanization of the language by Tuscan scribes.¹ Bertoni himself has shown how vulnerable this thesis is.²

What Dante therefore meant was precisely what he said, that there existed a standard form of Italian which was not to be found in any one of the towns or localities—a spoken language imperfectly mastered and reproduced in literature with varying success by previous writers. This was the language he himself adopted, perfected and consecrated to the high poetic purpose which inspired him, a language capable of adaptation to the various forms of literature, *illustre* for the highest forms, *mediocre* for the intermediate, *humile* for the lowest.

We are left with two further questions to answer: What was the nature of this *vulgare* (standard spoken Italian) and by what processes was it created? Here again I believe we cannot do better than believe what Dante tells us and what, incidentally, Bertoni believed when he wrote his *Duecento*.³ Against Bertoni's more recent theory of Florentine as the 'parler directeur'⁴ we may set Dante's own explicit words, according to which, if there was a 'parler directeur', it was the dialect of Bologna and not that of Florence. And if Dante had in fact created his literary language by a sort of sublimation of his native Florentine dialect, it seems to me inconceivable that, whatever his political sentiments may have been at the time of writing, he should have spoken of it as he did, condemning it roundly.

The process of standardization seems to have proceeded on two principles: (a) the elimination of the more pronounced dialectalisms and (b) the adaptation to Latin (or Latinization), the latter appearing as a conservative and archaizing tendency. This two-fold process produces inevitably a language occupying a more or less neutral position between the various dialects (or at least between the more important of them), deviating less from Latin and therefore in appearance conservative; and these are exactly the characteristics of the Tuscan dialect.⁵

¹ J. Sanesi, 'Il toscaneggiamento della poesia siciliana', *Giornale storico della lett. ital.*, xxxiv, 354 ff.

² G. Bertoni, 'Intorno alle questioni sulla lingua nella lirica italiana delle origini', *Studi Medievali*, i, 580 ff.

³ ...quanto al linguaggio comune o illustre, per usare il vocabolo di Dante, esso scorse, come vedremo, un po' da per tutto, dovunque erano vive e costanti tradizioni di studi e anche gagliardi rapporti commerciali o politici, a Bologna, a Firenze, a Lucca, ad Arezzo, nella corte imperiale e altrove (p. 73).

⁴ *Arch. Rom.*, xx, 98.

⁵ Cf. G. Bertoni, *Italia Dialettale*, Milan, Hoepli, 1916, pp. 123-33 and 205 (Bibliography).

Henceforth the Tuscan writer, and particularly the Florentine, was in a favoured position in that his native speech coincided to a remarkable degree with the language of literature. Once that language had been perfected and consecrated in the work of the Divine Poet, the favoured position of Florentine as the nearest living counterpart was immeasurably strengthened. It is only then that it begins to play its role of a 'parler directeur'. The rise of Florence to political, social and cultural pre-eminence conferred upon Florentine a further measure of that prestige which a dialect must have if it is to become a real 'parler directeur'.

This interpretation seems to me to fit the facts. It accounts also for the misconceptions and the false bias which have characterized the interminable controversy known as the language question, and it has the merit of showing that, in a sense, both sides were right, at least originally. But what is more to my present purpose, it vindicates completely Dante's observations and his programme. Whatever may have been the design of the complete treatise, and even if we grant that it was primarily intended to be an art of poetry in the vernacular, it is clear that Dante's observations on language are not subordinated. We must bear in mind that he is espousing the cause of Italian against the *lingua d'oco*, but we would do well to remember also the passionate declaration of love for his native tongue which he makes in the *Convito*. He loved his native language for its own sake, and we find him turning aside in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* to probe its secrets with a devotion born of that love.

Apart from a certain inconsistency or looseness in the use of terminology (no better and no worse than we find in certain more modern writers upon linguistic theory) his treatise reveals, alongside of views adopted from predecessors and reasoned out on scholastic lines, a most remarkable series of observations. They bear comparison with those of the modern, highly specialized field-worker preparing a linguistic atlas; they show a perception of the nature of speech and of the relation between standard speech and dialect which the philologists of the nineteenth century frequently lacked and which even those of the twentieth have, I venture to think, sometimes failed to appreciate at its true worth.

A. EWERT.

THE STAGE OF THE 'ENGLISCHE KOMÖDIANTEN' —THREE PROBLEMS

IN spite of the valuable work which has been done on the stage of the English Players in Germany in the seventeenth century, there is still uncertainty and confusion on several points. Even in recent publications no clear line is drawn between what we know for certain and what is speculative, and in general a rather rash analogy between the stage of these wandering players and that of the London theatres in Elizabeth's time has led to false conclusions. As would be expected, the true analogy is with the stage of contemporary wandering companies in England, the conditions governing whose productions were, as Chambers has pointed out,¹ strikingly different from those in the London theatres. It is my aim to sum up here the results of research, and to submit them to a critical examination. Attention will be directed in the main to the three most problematical aspects of the stage of the 'Englische Komödianten'²—the entrances, the balcony, and the curtain.

Any attempt to define the stage of the English Players must be cautious. Their popularity with the German public lasted through three or four generations and, in this time, not only the composition of the companies but also the form of the plays and productions changed. Baesecke³ rightly defines certain historical periods in their evolution. For the purposes of the present essay it is sufficient to distinguish between the stage from the arrival of the players in 1592 up to c. 1648, and in the period following 1648. There is no space here to mention all the differences between these two periods. In general, in the earlier period the 'Englische Komödianten' provided the dominant form of theatrical entertainment in Germany; in the later, the dominant forms were those of continental companies, Dutch, Italian, French, in particular of opera. For the earlier period, our main source is the collection of English plays published

¹ E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 1923, I, 345. See also his *Mediaeval Stage*, 1903, I, 192.

² By English Players we may legitimately understand not only the companies of English actors who travelled in Germany, but also the companies of wholly or mainly German actors who took over to a large extent the repertoire and methods of the earlier English companies, e.g. the troupe of Paulsen.

³ A. Baesecke, *Das Schauspiel der Englischen Komödianten in Deutschland*, Halle/Saale, 1935 (*Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, LXXXVII).

in 1620 (and the 1608 version of *Niemand und Jemand*). For the later period the sources are scattered publications and MSS.¹ It should be noted that the collection *Liebeskampff* of 1630, though claiming to be 'English comedies and tragedies', differs in content and form from the English tradition.² There is no evidence of the production of any of the plays of this collection till after 1650, and even then we have no knowledge of the nature of the production. We do wiser to leave the testimony of these plays on one side, as irrelevant to the problem of the stage of the English Players.

It must be borne in mind, further, that the stage of the English Players was not modelled on a fixed conception. They were wandering players, playing in many different types of rooms, never in possession of a theatre proper—there were no buildings used exclusively as theatres in the first half of the century in Germany, and the theatres in the second half were either built for opera or maintained at a few courts. The players had to be extremely adaptable, and prepared to play in any place to which a large audience would come. Though municipal accounts show that sometimes structural alterations would be carried out to suit the players' requirements, it is natural that such alterations should be on a small scale, as the companies would be moving on again after two or three weeks at the most. We can assume that the players were used to making shift with the barest necessity; the best they could hope for was a place used for periodic dramatic entertainments, with the most meagre appointments; and the possibility of building, in each place or even occasionally, an elaborate stage according to a fixed notion must be ruled out.

Another principle governing our approach concerns theatrical illusion. Too many writers on the stage of the wandering players apply to its problems preconceived notions on this point. In different periods, the relationship of the stage-world to the real world is different, and imagination willingly accepts the most unlikely juxtapositions on the stage. For the stage of the sixteenth century it has been convincingly shown that the play was a symbol, not a representation of real life, in which realistic

¹ The 1620 plays are published partly in A. Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany*, 1865; J. Tittmann, *Die Schauspiele der E. K. in Deutschland*, Leipzig, 1893; W. Creizenach, *Die Schauspiele der E. K.* (Deutsche Nat.-Literatur, Bd xxiii, 1889). The 1608 *Niemand und Jemand* is published in W. Flemming, *Das Schauspiel der Wanderbühne* (Deutsche Lit. in Entwicklungsreihen, Barockdrama 3, Leipzig, 1931). Plays of the later period are published in these collections, also in J. Bolte, *Das Danziger Theater*, Hamburg u. Leipzig, 1895 (*Theatergeschichtliche Forschungen*, xii).

² C. H. Kaulfuss-Diesch, *Die Inszenierung des deutschen Dramas*, Leipzig, 1905; Baesecke, p. 116. An analysis of the plays of this collection is given in W. Richter, *Liebeskampf und Schaubühne*, 1910 (*Palaestra*, lxxviii).

illusionism was unknown.¹ This is largely true for the stage of the English Players in the first half of the seventeenth century. For instance, the crudest suggestion suffices to make the audience of the wandering players understand changes in time or place (see *Titus Andronicus*, Act 3, ed. Creizenach). A few steps will indicate that the character has now moved from one place to another, and characters in different parts of the stage may be considered to be remote from one another. This technique is akin to that of the sixteenth-century Fastnachtspiel, in particular to that of the stage of the Meistersinger at Nurnberg,² and is related to the *décor simultané* of the mysteries. It is more flexible, however, and the movement of scene is more complex; the 'successive' character of the scenes is emphasized more than in earlier forms, to use Stumpff's term. When these conventions are understood, no arguments can be based on the assumption that a consistent illusion of a modern type had to be maintained.

The buildings which existed for popular entertainment were built for spectacles such as bear-baiting, ball-games, fencing, acrobatics, e.g. the Fechthaus at Nürnberg, the Fechtschule at Danzig, the Ballhaus at Augsburg and Vienna. These were usually constructed in the form of a quadrangle of covered stands, with galleries, looking on to an uncovered arena. The spectators stood or sat on all sides for the usual sorts of entertainment. This was so also in such localities as the Heilsbronner Hof at Nürnberg, where the inn buildings formed an L (with galleries), and spectators in the yard gathered round all sides of the show (see illustration in Könnecke, *Bilderatlas*, 2nd ed. 1895, p. 172).

For the purposes of dramatic entertainment it may safely be assumed that the stage was built against one side of the building and did not stand detached in the middle of the arena. The advantages of this position were known—the players thus would have a room for changing, for exits and entrances, opportunity to use the gallery, etc. It is clear, from the size of such buildings as the Nürnberg Fechthaus, that the stage would not occupy all one side of the arena, but only a part, and would jut out into the arena, so that spectators would stand round the stage in the 'pit' as well as look on from the front, side and back galleries. This

¹ H. Beck, *Das genrehafte Element im deutschen Drama des XVten Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, 1929 (*Germanische Studien*, LXVI).

² See R. Stumpff, *Die Bühnennöglichkeiten im XVten Jahrhundert* (*Ztschr. für deutsche Philologie*, LIV, 1929). The type is Stumpff's B 2. The earlier views on the Meistersinger stage of M. Herrmann, *Forschungen zur deutschen Theatergeschichte*, Berlin 1914, and A. Koster, *Die Meistersingerbühne des XVten Jahrhunderts*, Halle 1920, have to be modified in the light of the criticism of H. Engler, *Die Bühne des Hans Sachs* (*Ztschr. für deutsche Philologie*, LII) 1927, and of Stumpff.

one would expect to be the normal position of the stage in covered rooms, and it is similar to that in contemporary England.¹

THE ENTRANCES AND EXITS

It is very rarely indicated, in the stage directions of the plays, whether there is more than one entrance, but from an early reference in the *Niemand und Jemand* of 1608 we can assume that there were, as a rule, at least two entrances. Here the stage directions give: 'Hie khombt aus ein Thor Cornuel, zum andern Thor begegnet ihm Morganus' and 'Hie khomen Martianus und Malgo zu unterschiedlichen Thorn aus' (ed. Flemming, p. 114). The direction in *Titus Andronicus* that certain characters *follow* others in or out would suggest that they are not to enter or depart by an alternative door (ed. Creizenach, pp. 23 and 50). There is, in the earlier period of the 'Englische Komödianten', no indication of more than two exits.

With the use of scenery, entrances can multiply. The development of movable sets after 1648 provides the decisive change in the practice of the wandering players—a development which was most marked on the operatic stage, and thence percolated down to the popular performances. Thus, in *Tugend- und Læbesstreit* of 1677, which was performed at a court and has many operatic traces in it, we find Pickelhäring 'gehet zu einem Flügel ein, zum andern wieder aus' (ed. Creizenach, p. 97). Many of the plays of the wandering players, however, show no sign of movable sets right to the end of the century. In their staging we cannot assume more than the two entrances at the rear of the stage, except in so far as an alcove was used (see below).

Both Kaulfuss-Diesch and Flemming make the mistake of attempting to define a fixed stage of the English Players, when there was no such definite structure. Further, the designs in Kaulfuss-Diesch,² suggesting two entrances at the back and two at the side, imply a complicated structure which would not fit in with many localities, certainly not, for instance, with the Heilsbronner Hof in Nürnberg or the Fechtthaus there.³ Obviously, any big construction along the side of the stage would obstruct

¹ For example, the stage of the Swan Theatre in the famous sketch of de Witt (Chambers, II, 521). The frontispiece to *The Wits* of 1672, formerly considered to be a drawing of the Red Bull Theatre, shows the type of stage used at that time in England when the public theatres were closed. The stage is a bare platform, built against a wall, the door in which, covered with a curtain, serves as exit and entrance. There is here a small balcony over the door, also covered with a curtain. (Reproduction in J. Gregor, *Weltgeschichte des Theaters*, Zurich, 1933, p. 284).

² Kaulfuss-Diesch, *op. cit.*, pp. 235–6. These diagrams would imply a stage of enormous size (for those times) if they were fitted into, say, the area of the Heilsbronner Hof or the Fechtthaus at Nürnberg.

³ See illustrations of these in Könnecke, *Bilderatlas*, 2nd ed., 1895, p. 172.

the view of the spectators in the side-places; and it would be very rare that the stage would fill the whole of one end of a room.

THE BALCONY

There is good evidence that the English Players used a balcony over the back of the stage. In *Titus Andronicus* Titus 'siehet von oben hinunter' when the Queen and her two sons visit him (ed. Creizenach, Act VII). In the *Stummer Ritter* (c. 1670) the Queen and Mariana watch the duels from 'oben auff einer Galerey' (ed. Bolte, Act. I, Sc. 4). The prologue to *Der bestrafte Brudermord* of the same period is spoken 'von oben'. Probably Juliet's 'Kammerfenster' was also in the balcony. The balcony was therefore used, but it must be pointed out that it was used sparingly, and so far as we know not for whole scenes. A very small area must have been reserved for the balcony,¹ and obviously, at a pinch, the players could do without the balcony. From the evidence of the *Stummer Ritter* we can see that this balcony was not at all high—here, a knight hands his enemy's sword to his lady in the balcony; one can imagine even that this balcony was a crude affair of trestles and planks.

Creizenach (*op. cit.*, pp. xcii–xciii) suggests that a balcony is indicated in the hanging scene in *Esther*, and in palace scenes of the *Jemand und Niemand* of 1620 (Act III). There seems, however, more to be said for Kaulfuss-Diesch's opinion that in *Esther* the gallows is actually erected before our eyes and Haman is not hanged from the balcony; and that, in *Jemand und Niemand*, the steps up which the characters rush are the steps of the throne (*op. cit.*, pp. 63 and 70).

It is certainly not wise to make generalizations from the famous stage which Spencer had made to his specifications at Regensburg in 1612. This had, above the 'theatre-stage', another one, built on six columns, 30 ft. high.² The elaborateness and cost of this structure, the uniqueness of the reference, suggest that this stage was an exception, and that the upper stage here was to be used for the particular purposes of Spencer's *Türkische Triumphkomödie*. Such a structure seems to reflect the preparations for the solemn entries of sovereigns into the cities of that time, rather than the needs of the normal acting company (see descriptions of triumphal arches, columns, tableaux in London and elsewhere in Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, I, c. 4, in Bolte, *op. cit.*, pp. 57, 70, etc. Reproductions are given in C. Niessen, *Das Bühnenbild*, 1924, Tafeln 15 and 16).

¹ For example, Act I, Sc. 1 of *Der bestrafte Brudermord*, though situated on the 'Bastey', is clearly played on the normal stage-level.

² Mettenleiter, *Musikgeschichte Regensburgs*, Regensburg, 1866.

How much the use of the balcony in Germany belongs specifically to the English tradition is a question hard to decide. Not only in the Rederijker stage, but also in early Jesuit productions, a balcony is used, mainly for tableaux, which seems to be directly developed from the raised Heaven of the mystery stage.¹

THE CURTAIN

On two points we can be clear. The wall or walls of the stage were hung with arras, as in contemporary England. The Prodigal Son turned beggar knocks for alms at houses behind the stage and receives answer 'unter den Tapetichten' (*Vom Verlorenen Sohn*, 1620, ed. Tittmann, Act v). Corambus (Polomus) hides himself 'hinter die Tapeten' in *Der bestrafte Brudermord*, Act III, Sc. 4. Hence the many yards of cloth which Spencer and other directors carried with them. The second point is, that there is no evidence of a front-curtain, dividing stage from audience, in the first half of the century, and little in the later part. Thus at the end of each act all characters have to make their exit, corpses and properties have to be carried off, the feast in *Titus* has to be carried in; similarly, in *Tiberius und Annabella*, Act v, Sc. 8 and 9 (c. 1670; ed. Bolte, *Das Danziger Theater*), a table has to be brought in and carried off in full sight of the spectators.² The introduction of the front-curtain depended no doubt very largely on the sort of room or theatre that the actors occupied. From 1660 the influence of court and operatic plays is evident, in repertoire, style, and technique of the wandering players.³ Thus we find in 1670 George Bentley, one of the very last English Players (though a director of 'hochteutsche Comoedianten'), playing in the evening, with artificial light, instead of in the afternoon in daylight, as was the earlier custom.⁴ Altogether, as far as the English Players were concerned, or as far as those companies were concerned which played English plays in the English style, the stage was without a front-curtain.

Was there a middle-curtain, dividing the stage into a large fore-stage and a small, alcove-like rear-stage, as is fairly well attested for the London theatres of the Elizabethan period? Statements on this possibility demand critical examination.

¹ This is the contention of R. Stumpf in *Süddeutsche Bühnenformen vor Einführung der italienischen Verwandlungsbühne* (*Ztschr. für deutsche Philologie*, LIII), 1928.

² Similarly in plays in *Liebeskampff*. In *Tragikomedie*, Act II, Sc. 2, and in *Tragodie vom unzeitigen Vorwitz*, Act II, Sc. 3, servants clear off table and benches from the stage at the end of the scene (ed. Creizenach, *Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten*).

³ For example, Treu advertises his 'mutationen' (changes of scenery) in 1666, and Velten used a court stage at Bevern and Dresden in 1680.

⁴ Bolte, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

In Creizenach, *op. cit.*, p. xcii, we read: 'Dagegen wurde auf dem Kontinent die einfache und sinnreiche Vorrichtung angewendet, die auf der englischen Bühne den Szenenwechsel so ungemein erleichtert, dass sich nämlich im Hintergrund durch einen Vorhang verhüllbar noch ein kleinerer Bühnenraum befindet.' Contrary to Creizenach's customary practice, this assertion is not supported by any proofs. A similar assertion is made by R. Genée in his *Lehr- und Wanderjahre des deutschen Schauspiels*, 1882, p. 289, and later, on p. 331, Genée gives examples from Rist, Gryphius and Kongehl, writers definitely not belonging to the tradition of the English Players.

The theme of the middle-curtain has been taken up again recently by W. Flemming. In *Carl XII* of 1724 he finds actual mention of a 'mittel-Guardine' in the *Jude von Venedig* of c. 1670, too, since there is the direction. 'die innere Scena eroffnet sich' (Act v, Sc. 5, ed. Flemming). Flemming conjectures, further, that the phrases: 'hier praesentiret sich im Tempel ein Altar' in *Der bestrafte Brudermord*, and 'das Theatrum praesentiret Wald und Pallast' in the *König Lear* of 1692 signify a drawing of the middle-curtain to reveal a scene in the rear-stage, but though something may be said for this conjecture in the first case, it is very dubious whether it can be maintained in the second. From these scraps of evidence Flemming goes on to deduce a rhythm of production, an alternation of scenes from an undefined locality on the fore-stage to a more precise locality on the rear-stage. He suggests that in the *Jude von Venedig*, Act III, Sc. 3, 'Jud in seiner herrligkeit' appears on this rear-stage, although there is no indication of this; and, further, that the opening three scenes, in which a number of characters appear, would be played on the rear-stage. Flemming then applies his deductions to the stage in the first half of the century, and though he admits that there is no direct evidence, in the form of stage-directions or otherwise, for the use of the middle-curtain in that period, he yet maintains its existence, and asserts that it was so self-evident a fact that it did not need mentioning—'Aus dem Nichtsagen des Selbstverständlichen folgt keineswegs dessen Nichtexistenz'. Finally, Flemming sketches a plan of a stage which purports to be from Chambers' *Elizabethan Stage*, but which he has significantly modified to prove the possibility of playing scenes on the rear-stage, though Chambers himself points out the difficulty of understanding this rear-stage, and in particular stresses its small size, which meant that whole scenes could not possibly be played in it.¹

¹ W. Flemming, *Das Schauspiel der Wanderbühne*, pp. 41-9. E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, III, 82 ff. The diagrams are to be found: Flemming p. 47, and Chambers p. 84.

Other writers have been unwilling to make a hypothesis for which there is so little evidence. Kaulfuss-Diesch observes that the middle-curtain in Germany arises from the Terentian tradition, not from the English at all, and becomes established only after the middle of the century (*op. cit.*, p. 53). Baesecke also observes: 'Flemming setzt... den Gebrauch der Mittelgardine auf der Bühne der EK zu früh an. Die Texte von 1608 und von 1620 sprechen deutlich gegen ihre Verwendung, wie ja auch die frühen elisabethanischen Dramen sie noch nicht kennen. . . Die Mittelgardine, so wie Flemming sie darstellt, lässt sich erst nach dem 30jährigen Kriege nachweisen' (*op. cit.*, p. 57). Both these authors, however, postulate a fairly rigid distinction between a 'rear-stage' and a 'fore-stage'. In Kaulfuss-Diesch's diagrams the 'rear-stage' is the back part of the stage, enclosed on three sides by walls hung with arras, and with a gallery looking directly down on it. The 'fore-stage' is the proscenium, which juts freely out into the theatre (pp. 235-6). There is a certain relationship between this and de Witt's design of the Swan in London, the 'rear-stage' corresponding with the covered part of the stage of the Swan (though in the latter the stage seems to have no side structures at all, and no side entrances). It seems that Baesecke agrees in general with Kaulfuss-Diesch that the stage of the English Players was divided into 'Hinterbühne' and 'Vorderbühne' (p. 13). For Kaulfuss-Diesch this is a sharp distinction, applicable wherever the English Players played (p. 79); and in his analyses of the English plays he firmly allots certain scenes to the 'Vorderbühne', others to the 'Hinterbühne' (pp. 65 ff.).

The above-mentioned theories are a mixture of speculation and fact. I think the evidence does not allow of more than the following conclusions.

The stage of the English Players has no middle-curtain before approximately 1648; i.e. there was not a small alcove at the rear, cut off by a curtain, providing an alternative to the vague locality of the main part of the stage. Flemming's assumptions are entirely without proof for this part of the century.

Equally, there is no testimony for the division of the stage into a rear-stage and a front-stage. Kaulfuss-Diesch's definition is dependent on the existence of side-structures, enclosing part of the sides of the stage (these are assumed wherever the Players performed!), so that the rear part of the stage forms a fairly clearly separated area. There is no evidence for these side-structures, and we cannot postulate anything more than a plain platform as the stage of the English Players in the first half of the century.

Spencer's stage, as described in Mettenleiter, must be considered a great exception, and also as rather obscure in its purpose.

For the period after 1648, the use of the curtain and the division of the stage are much more complex. The main fact is that the English tradition is submerged in others, and that the successors of the English Players, such as Paulsen or Velten, while accustomed to use the old undivided stage, would be acquainted with newer forms of stage and eager to use them wherever possible. Thus, if they happened to get possession of movable scenery ('coulisses') they would gladly use the sets; if they found a stage with a front-curtain, or a middle-curtain, they would use them to make effects new for wandering players. On the whole, however, the wandering players remained excluded up to the time of Caroline Neuber from the use of the opera-theatres, with their front-curtains, scenery, footlights, and had to make shift with more primitive arrangements. Even the Neubers played in the same buildings as the English Players a hundred years before, e.g. in the Fechtthaus at Nürnberg; the old Fechtschule at Danzig was rebuilt into a 'Komödiantenbude' only in 1730 (Bolte, *op. cit.*, p. 162).¹

In this period, between the time of the undivided stage of the English Players and that of the operatic stage, falls the use of the middle-curtain shielding a rear-portion of the stage from the rest. What is the origin of this middle-curtain, and how widely was it used by the wandering players?

We first find it used at times in the *Liebeskampff* of 1630; in Jesuit productions; then in plays of Rist (*Friedewunschendes Deutschland* 1647), of Gryphius (after 1648), in a Latin play of Raue of 1648 (see the detailed analysis of this school-play in Bolte, *op. cit.*, pp. 82 ff.). Descriptions of the theatre of this time, bearing obviously an Italian influence, frequently describe this arrangement. The frontispiece of *Teutscher Schaubühnen, I Theyl*, Strassburg, 1655, shows an elaborate perspective-stage, with movable scenery, and a rear portion with a curtain (there seems also to be a front-curtain, as with Raue).²

The middle-curtain belonged, therefore, in the seventeenth century to the old tradition of the school-stage, and the new influence from Italy. We can trace it further back. Stumpff's penetrating analysis of the staging of the sixteenth century has shown how a school-stage, such as

¹ Many of the old rooms were, of course, adapted to the new technique as time went on. For example, around 1700 we find a perspective stage with middle-curtain at the Fleischhaus at Leipzig, cf. F. J. Schneider, *Christian Reuters Komödien und die Bühne* (Ztschr. für deutsche Philologie, LXII), 1937.

² Reproduction in Gregor, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

Exeditus Schmidt defines it, never existed.¹ The use of 'scenae' with curtains before them, indicating separate localities, goes back to the medieval mystery plays (see the illustration of, e.g., the Valenciennes play in C. Niessen, *Das Bühnenbild*, 1924, Tafel 14). In the productions by schools during the sixteenth century the number of 'scenae' tended to decline, a concentration occurred until one curtained alcove remained which could be used for a number of purposes. With Rist and Gryphius and other learned writers, and on the later Jesuit stage, this school-tradition was absorbed by the new Italian stage. This, with its movable sets and perspective stage divided into fore-stage and *large* rear-stage, represents something quite new in German stage history, and its influence extended to the staging of the wandering players. The 'innere scena' of the *Jude von Venedig* undoubtedly belonged to this tradition, and provides the first evidence of the use of a middle-curtain and rear-stage on the stage of the wandering players of the English tradition (c. 1670!). The use of the middle-curtain occurred, therefore, at a time when the English tradition on the German stage was being ousted, in repertoire and personnel, by other plays and players.

It will be seen, I believe, that Flemming's view on the middle-curtain and its use is not well founded. There seems no doubt that, as far as the area of the stage was concerned, the English Players and their German descendants relied above all on an imaginative use of the undivided stage. Stumpff's suggestion that the English Players are of little significance in the history of the German theatre (in the narrow sense) seems justified;² their importance lies in the sphere of acting and repertoire. Flemming and Baesecke have admirably brought out the dramatic qualities of the plays they performed. It is not hard to imagine how, even on the simple stage with which they had to be content, without scenery, lights, or curtain, these English Players dazzled and delighted successive generations of spectators.

BIRMINGHAM.

R. PASCAL.

¹ Stumpff, *op. cit.* and in *Süddeutsche Bühnenformen von Einführung der italienischen Verwandlungsbühne* (*Ztschr. für deutsche Philologie*, LIII), 1928; Exeditus Schmidt, *Die Bühnenverhältnisse des deutschen Schuldramas*, Berlin, 1903. Schmidt bases his conclusions largely on the illustrations of editions of Terence, though there is no evidence that these have any relation with actual productions (as Max Herrmann pointed out, *Forschungen zur deutschen Theatergeschichte*, Berlin, 1914). The testimony of the *Liebeskampff* is rather bewildering unless we bear in mind that these plays were not written by anyone in close touch with the theatre and few of them were actually played. There is here one curtained alcove, which is extremely small. No scenes are enacted in this so-called 'scena', we hear voices issuing from it, characters use it as a means of entrance, but as a rule speak only when half-way out of it, as in the Terence illustrations reproduced in Herrmann and Schmidt. The curtain is never drawn back to reveal an interior; at most there is a 'gehaw' in it, through which a character speaks (*Tragikomödie*, Act V, Sc. 4, ed. Creizenach). Nothing of all this is to be found in the stage of the English Players.

² Stumpff, *Die Bühnenmöglichkeiten*, p. 74.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

WILLIAM SAMPSON'S 'VOW-BREAKER' (1636) AND THE LOST HENSLOWE PLAY 'BLACK BATMAN OF THE NORTH'

F. E. Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama* (1908), I, 348-9, seems to have been the first to suggest that William Sampson's *The Vow-Breaker or The Faire Maide of Clifton* (1636) is 'no doubt a making over of *Black Batman* or *Bateman of the North* of Henslowe's mention'. He does not argue the question and apparently bases this assumption solely on the fact that Sampson's hero is called James Bateman. Hans Wallrath's edition of *The Vow-Breaker* (Bang's *Materialen*, 1914) does not pursue the enquiry. But there are certain features which suggest the probability of Sampson's use of *Black Batman*.

(1) In the somewhat apologetic 'Prologue to Censurers' in Sampson's play, the dramatist claims that his story is true, and apologizes for its old-fashionedness:

And yet me thinkes I here some Criticke say
That they are much abus'd in this our Play.
Their Magistracy laught at ' as if now
What Ninty Yeeres since dy'd, afresh did grow.

Sampson may refer here to the historical action of the play, which is concerned with the Siege of Leith; but ninety years ago is too early for this.

(2) The story of James Bateman and Jerman's wife was on Sampson's admission a traditional one, and several ballad versions of it are extant; one of these is in fact quoted near the end of the play (V. 1; sig. T3^v). See F. G. Fleay, *Biog. Chron.* I, 157; Schelling, *op. cit.*, I, 348 n.; Wallrath, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-18. W. W. Greg (*Henslowe's Diary*, II, 193), writing of *Black Batman*, names a chapbook of c. 1710, which quotes an earlier broadside, but he considers that 'the story . . . can hardly be as old as the play'. Sampson's Prologue, however, seems to show that it was a good deal older.

(3) Drayton was one of the authors of *Black Batman*, receiving payment for the first part with Chettle, Dekker, and Wilson on 22 May 1598 (*Henslowe's Diary*, ed. W. W. Greg, 45 v.).

The scene of the story is Clifton in Notts, which might be expected to interest Drayton as a setting; his *Mortimeriados* (1596), *Barons Wars* (1603), *Poly-Olbion*, Song 26 (1622) and his *Elegie on Lady Penelope Clifton* (*Battle of Agincourt* 1627, poem written c. 1613) all testify to his

knowledge of the district, and the *Elegie* shows that he knew Clifton itself. To refer to Nottinghamshire as 'the North' would be perfectly natural.

The objection might be raised that the title of the Henslowe play suggests that Bateman is a villainous character, while *The Vow-Breaker* shows him as the innocent victim of a heartless jilt. But his appearance as a ghost, arousing the heroine to repentance and ultimately leading to her death by drowning, surely justifies the epithet 'black' in the not uncommon sense of 'deadly, baneful'.

(4) Sampson is an imitative poet, and in his volume of elegies, *Virtus Post Funera Vivit* (1636), he shows an acquaintance with the historical poems of Drayton.

Though the point scarcely affects the question of literary derivation, it is interesting to note that Sampson may have known Drayton personally, since they had a common patron in Sir Henry Willoughby, of Risley, Derbyshire. Sampson was his servant by 1628; Drayton inscribed a copy of his poems to Willoughby in 1627. (See Drayton, *Works*, ed. J. W. Hebel, III, 9; Wallrath, *op. cit.*, p. 5, and the dedication of Sampson's play to Mistress Anne Willoughby.)

Note. The earliest known complete version of the Bateman ballad appears to date from about 1650; but owing to the removal of the Roxburghe collection from the British Museum I have not seen this nor any other seventeenth century version. I have however seen the prose chapbook referred to by Greg. It is entitled 'Bateman's Tragedy; or the Perjur'd Bride Justly Rewarded'. The earlier ballad, which it quotes, is entitled 'A Godly Warning to all Maidens by the Example of Gods Judgment shewed on German's Wife of Clifton...' and this includes eight lines very similar to those quoted by Sampson. See also Ritson's *Ancient Songs and Ballads*, 1877, pp. 231-5.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

A FORGOTTEN TRANSLATION OF LOPE DE VEGA

During the preparation of volume xv in the new edition of the British Museum's *General Catalogue of Printed Books*, one of my colleagues found himself faced with an anonymous play entitled *La Bella Brutta*, 'transferred from the Spanish to the Italian theatre', and printed in Italian at Paris in 1666. Being unfamiliar with Spanish literature, my colleague came to consult me as to the original.

It is not often that one is presented with so simple a problem. The title *La Bella Brutta* translated itself back into Spanish quite naturally as *La Hermosa Fea*, which at once suggested Lope de Vega as the author of the original. A comparison of the Spanish and Italian texts showed that while Lope de Vega's *La Hermosa Fea* is entirely in verse, and *La Bella Brutta* entirely in prose, the latter is a reasonably faithful translation of the former.

The British Museum copy of *La Bella Brutta* is part of its old stock; it has long figured in the Museum's *General Catalogue of Printed Books*. Copies are also entered in the *Catalogue général des Livres imprimés* of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and the play is recorded in detailed histories of the French theatre. As the author's name appears never to have been supplied, the play has not been gathered into the various Lope de Vega catalogues and bibliographies. The following bibliographical description of the book may therefore be useful:

La Bella/Brutta/Comedia/dallo Spagnuolo/portata al Theatro Italiano dà/Orsola Biancolelli./Fra' Comici Italiani/di S.M.C^{ma} detta Eularia./Dedicata/Alla Maestà Chris^{ma} di Luigi xiv./Rè di Francia, e di Navarra./[Six small crowns]/In Parigi,/Per Guglielmo Sassier Stampator Reale./Nella Corte d'Albaretto, vicino à S.Hi-/lario, all' insegna delle due Tortore./M DC.LXVI./Con Privileggio Reale./

12°. sig. a⁶ A-I⁶. pp. [xii.] 108.

The preliminaries consist of the translator's fulsome dedication to King Louis XIV, her apologetic address to the courteous reader, a list of the *interlocutori*, a madrigal on the word *Brutta* by Du Pelletier, two approbations dated 21 April 1665, and an extract from the royal privilege granted 26 April 1665 to last for five years from the day the book was printed off for the first time. To this is appended the note: 'Achevé d'imprimer pour la premiere fois le 28. jour de Novembre 1665. *Les Exemplaires ont esté fournis.*' There follows a note of registration dated 11 May 1665.

The Bibliothèque Nationale possesses two copies of *La Bella Brutta*, entered in the *Catalogue général des livres imprimés* under the heading Biancolelli. The first is evidently one of the advance copies which were 'fournis', for it bears the date 1665. The other, like the Museum copy, is dated 1666 and represents the main edition; it is in a red morocco binding with the arms of Louis XIV, and is no doubt a presentation copy to the King.

The printing of a Spanish play in an Italian version in the French capital during the seventeenth century merits a brief explanation, for the benefit of those unfamiliar with the history of the French theatre.

There are records of individual Italians acting in France around the

middle of the sixteenth century. In 1571, during the reign of Charles IX, son of Catherine de Médicis, a company of Italian players brought the *commedia dell' arte* to Paris, where it was so popular with the King and the nobility that other companies were induced to follow. Visits of Italian companies to France became increasingly common in the reigns of Henry III, another son of Catherine, Henry IV, whose consort was Marie de Médicis, and Louis XIII, Marie's son. At length, at the beginning of 1662, in the reign of Louis XIV, whose minister was the Italian cardinal Mazarin, the Italian players were given a settled home in Paris in the Palais Royal. There they shared quarters with Molière's troupe till his death in 1673, when they and their French comrades were moved elsewhere (cf. E. Despois, *Le Théâtre français sous Louis XIV*, Paris, 1874).

During the whole of the period that the Italians were playing in the Palais Royal, there was also a Spanish theatre in Paris. Louis XIV married Maria Teresa, daughter of Philip IV of Spain, in 1660, and from that date till 1673 Spanish players acted in the French capital, though they were never so popular as the Italian players, who remained there till 1697, when they were suppressed (*ibid.*).

A player who joined the Italian company in Paris the year before their establishment in the Palais Royal was Domenico Biancolelli, a famous Harlequin. He found already there another recent recruit, Orsola Cortesi, who was playing the part of an *amorosa*. She played it so much to Domenico's satisfaction that the year after the establishment the two were married, making their home in France and in due course becoming naturalized (cf. L. Rasi, *I Comici Italiani*, vol. I, Firenze, 1897).

Orsola Cortesi-Biancolelli reached Paris in the same year as the Spanish players. Her profession and her reputed ancestry—for she claimed to be descended from Hernando Cortés—would make her a natural link between the Spanish players, her compatriots, and Molière's troupe. Whatever her previous knowledge of the Spanish drama, her association with the Spanish players would improve it. To them she may owe her acquaintance with *La Bella Brutta*. Although she confesses that the play 'is not perhaps one of the most esteemed', her choice of it for translation and printing in France was a natural one, as the heroine is Duchess of Lorraine and the scene of the action Nancy. It is to be hoped that she was not mistaken about her ancestry, for there is a dramatic appropriateness in the idea of a descendant of the conqueror of Mexico introducing Lope de Vega to his great French counterpart.

H. THOMAS.

LONDON.

REVIEWS

Modern Language Quarterly. Edited by RAY HEFFNER and others.
Seattle: University of Washington Press Vol. I, No. 1. March 1940.
126 pp. \$0.75. \$2.00 per year.

The *Modern Language Review*, which has so many contacts with the great world of American scholarship, welcomes the appearance of a new sister periodical. There is no statement of editorial policy in this first number of the new periodical. But it would appear that it proposes to print articles and reviews in all the various fields of modern language study, and that it is open to contributors without restriction. There is great need for such facilities for the publication of original scholarly work, not least in the United States, as is abundantly evident from the amount of American work submitted to the *Modern Language Review*, which has for many years kept an open door to all scholars, work which has indeed adorned the *Review*.

The contributions to this first number have drawn upon the strength of a wide selection of American Universities, from Harvard in the East to Johns Hopkins in the South and Berkeley in the West, as well as from the University of Washington itself and the great research libraries, the Huntington and Folger libraries. And the first list of contributors is an imposing one, headed by such elder statesmen as J. D. M. Ford and J. Quincy Adams. The field covered is wide, from Ford's high philology to Spitzer's or Godfrey Davies' critical method, from Archer Taylor's comparative study of ballad themes to Kemp Malone's biography of Ecgtheow or the presentation of new documents by Quincy Adams and J. G. McManaway. There is an interesting study of Raleigh's thought by Ernst Strathmann. Spanish-American modernism in poetry is dealt with by G. W. Umphrey, and Herman Melville by E. H. Eby.

The section of reviews is as yet inconsiderable in comparison, but it will doubtless grow as the journal develops.

The format and the typography of the journal are pleasing. Further care in proof-reading may seem to be required, if we may judge by a number of escaped errors in Professor Spitzer's article, e.g. *légèrment*, *histrico*-, *italhienne*, *Hadyn*, which, I observe, occur in an article written in French. It will be a question for the board of editors to consider how far they may go in admitting languages other than English. It is certainly a strain upon the printing-house to multiply languages.

The editorial board, led by Professor Ray Heffner, and including that fine old English scholar Professor Padelford, with Professors Griffith, Vail and Nostrand, ensures the maintenance of the high standard set up by this first number. It is good to see such enterprise and activity in the Far West, in that University of Washington at Seattle which I myself had occasion to admire on a visit some fifteen years ago as a centre of scholarship bent on greater achievements.

C. J. Sisson.

LONDON.

Sawles Warde. Edited by R. M. WILSON. xlv + 115 pp.

The Conflict of Wit and Will. Edited by BRUCE DICKINS. 26 pp. (*Leeds School of English Language Texts and Monographs*, III and IV.)
Leeds: School of English Language. 1938. 8s. 6d.

Notwithstanding the valuable work done on *Sawles Warde* by Hall in his *Early Middle English*, there has always been room for a separate edition in English of this important text, and especially for one reproducing all three MSS in full. Mr Wilson's outstanding contribution is his literary introduction, the direction of which had been suggested by Professors Chambers and Tolkien in certain well-known essays. It is an attempt to establish continuity in the art of prose-writing in the pre-Conquest and the post-Conquest periods, and particularly to illustrate the now generally accepted fact that there was a distinct and vigorous literary tradition in the West, both in verse and in prose: the numerous post-Conquest MSS. of O.E. works, the personal influence of Wulfstan and his share in making Worcester a focus of literary activity, the seclusion of the West Midlands and their comparative immunity from the new Gallic culture, are all adduced and discussed. This is a purely historical sketch, in which scholars will note with satisfaction the ample and careful reference to the texts themselves and especially to the MSS. Mr Wilson is probably more at home on such ground as this than on any other: he shows himself to be well-informed and to have a grasp of method.

The text is handled in such a way as to ensure its being useful and convenient for the reader. Mr Wilson prints each MS. more or less as it stands, and is content to comment in his notes on corrupt readings and divergences among the MSS. He differs from Hall in regularizing the word-division in MS. Bodl. 34 (e.g. *fortruste* 59, *gledread* 78, *tocheoweð* 101); but this is justifiable. He has added a new reading of this MS. in l. 89; for Hall's *readien* he prefers *reodien*, which disposes of an awkward divergence from *reoden* in C and *rodien* in R. The third letter is curiously shaped in the MS., and is evidently another case of that erratic writing in which scribes occasionally departed from their normal practice by an ill-controlled stroke; but *o* is at least as likely to be right as *a*.

In the notes Mr Wilson shows a capacity for careful handling of linguistic material, and has added something on various points (e.g. on *wundre* in l. 11, and *sea dingle* 320). If there is room for improvement in this section, it is in the shaping and the exposition of the material. Details calling for comment of one kind or another include the following:

103. The translation proposed in the notes is 'and unmistakably they see themselves to be exceedingly terrible and awful', but this is inadmissible. *Grisle* and *grure* are substantives, not adjectives, and *ham* is historically not an accusative but a dative; and the construction is therefore a double dative of the kind common in M.E.: 'they see, to their horror and dismay, and as an aggravation of their torments, the horrible reptiles of hell. ...'

137. *Dustlunges* cannot properly be compared with the adverbs *endlong*, *headlong*, since the latter have a different suffix. M.E. *dusten* is not

'peculiar to the AR and the KGr'; the *N.E.D.* cites examples from Shoreham and *Sir Ferumbas*.

145. O.E. *gēgan* is here cited as a hypothetical form (though in the glossary the asterisk is omitted). Professor E. V. Gordon pointed out in his review of Miss d'Ardenne's edition of *St Juliene* (*Medium Ævum*, vi, 138-9) that the word occurs in extant O.E. documents.

302. That *setnesse* is the original word, and that the author must have used it in the sense 'order, class', is established by the Latin version: *De singulis beatorum ordinibus*. No examples of this sense are recorded in the *N.E.D.* The gloss 'sentence, paragraph' is inadmissible.

338. The quotations from *Ancrene Wisse* and *Halv Merðhad* are not parallels to the use of *iseede* here in *Sawles Warde*: in the former the verb *seve* is used in the active voice and means 'to denote, represent', but here is used in the passive form and means 'enumerated, counted, described'. See *N.E.D.* s.v. 4 and 8 respectively.

387. *Sawle* in the second note on this line is presumably a slip for *heorte*

In the section on phonology Mr Wilson has contrived to pack a good deal of information into limited space, and his account is sound. Occasionally he omits to distinguish clearly between a spelling and its phonetic value, as under the headings O.E. *ea* and O.E. *eo*. In the case of *ea* especially it is important to keep the distinction clearly in view, see d'Ardenne, *op. cit.*, Phonology, chapter 2, § 1. A little more use might have been made of the results presented in the latter book; for instance, in the account of the accident of MS. B. 1. 34 there is no mention of the inorganic *-e* in *huselauerd*, *husewif* nor of the neat explanation given by Miss d'Ardenne (§ 63, note 2).

In a brief section (xxxv-xxxviii) of the dialect of *Sawles Warde*, Mr Wilson concludes that the 'Katherin' group' was written in the West Midlands and perhaps in Herefordshire, but that it cannot be localized more exactly than this; he shows good judgment here, as in his arguments against the views of Miss Serjeant. The glossary has been done in sufficient detail to be of considerable value. There is just one small inconsistency of method that might confuse undergraduates. *Heateð* is correctly referred to O.M. **heatian*, this *heatel* to O.M. **heatol*, but under *meaðen* and *neafola* (which also have *Eng* by the distinctive Mercian back-mutation of *æ*) the glossary merely states 'cf. O.E. *maða* (*nafola*)', though the origin of the *ea* in all these words is correctly explained in the section on phonology (p. 84). Finally, under *nease*, Mr Wilson merely quotes O.E. *nosu*, *nasu* (without the 'cf.' which would indicate that the M.E. word does not directly derive from these forms).

Mr Wilson's work has qualities that are needed in M.E. studies: he shows an attention to linguistic detail and a competence in handling linguistic problems that have been lacking in many recent editions. This book is probably his best published work; it is solid and well-balanced.

Professor Dickins has edited the extant fragments (amounting to less than 150 verses) of a curious and difficult alliterative poem which he entitles 'The Conflict of Wit and Will', and which has not hitherto been

though always prepared to use the latest and most 'scientific' methods on problems to which he thought them adapted, he could not satisfy himself that modern scholarship had enabled us to read under the printed texts of 'undoubtedly varied provenance' as in a palimpsest what may be called a normal Shakespeare original. 'We cannot hope', he says, 'to infer with any approach to certainty Shakespeare's own practice as regards such details as spelling, capitalization, the use of italics, or punctuation.' It was his intention, therefore, 'to determine for each play separately the most authoritative text of those which have come down to us from early times, and to reprint this as exactly as possible save for manifest and indubitable errors'.

The meaning to be attached to 'authoritative' and 'authority' is discussed at length in Chapter I, 'The Basis of a Reprint'. This is one of the most interesting and controversial sections of the book, and it is here particularly that the student must remember the kind of edition Dr McKerrow wished to produce.

From this he passes in Chapter II to 'The Degree of Exactitude to be aimed at in Reproducing the Copy Text'. His intention was to take as little for granted as possible and to let the evidence speak for itself. But here and there he had to take an important decision for the reader, as when he says: 'There is one type of irregular punctuation which I have felt bound to alter, namely those rather numerous cases in which a clause is separated by a major stop, such as a semicolon, colon, or full point, from another to which it logically belongs, while at the same time it is only separated by a comma from one with which it has much less close logical connexion.' One may think that the arguments with which Dr McKerrow supports this decision are far from convincing and yet recognize that he could hardly have done otherwise in his text.

Chapter III treats of 'The Recording of the Readings of other Editions than the Copy-text'. One of the most valuable parts of the edition was to be the apparatus which would 'put the reader in a position to form his own judgment' about the soundness of the text. He would have been able to jettison much of the lumber that encumbers the Cambridge edition, and by an ingeniously devised series of signs he could summarize in brief space almost everything in later texts that might help to correct or interpret the copy-text. One of the most interesting points here is the revival in however modified a form of Theobald's conception of editions of 'middle authority'.

It is to be hoped that at not too distant a date the delegates of the Clarendon Press will be able 'in a better world than this' to arrange for the publication of an edition planned in so thorough and so scholarly a manner.

PETER ALEXANDER.

GLASGOW.

King Richard II. By WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. Edited by J. DOVER WILSON. Cambridge: University Press. 1939. xciv + 250 pp. 8s. 6d.

In the second of the Histories which he has edited Professor Dover Wilson pays increased attention to their special problems. A sometimes substantial essay on the Material is printed in small type at the head of the notes on each scene, and much of the long introduction is concerned with the sources and the composition of the play. These two questions rest partly on the same evidence, and so have to be worked out together, but the editor's answers may be summarized separately.

He holds that although Shakespeare had an actor's knowledge of *Thomas of Woodstock*, and had read Daniel, his chief source was a lost play on *Richard II* written by a scholar of wide reading (possibly the author of *The Troublesome Raigne of John King of England*) who even drew on unprinted fourteenth-century French manuscripts. This account of the sources is not revolutionary, though it uses and brilliantly develops some neglected modern studies.

He clearly believes that in *Richard II* Shakespeare wrote all at one time a substantially new work, taking most of his raw material from the hypothetical lost play in much the same way as he took that for *King John* from *The Troublesome Raigne*, but following his original more closely, especially in Act v. I am disconcerted at finding what I should call original composition described as 'revision', but to exemplify his use of the word Wilson refers to his introduction to *King John* (pp. xxxiv sq.), where we are invited, in order 'to realize what Shakespearian revision meant', to regard the second of the following passages as a revision of the first:

Pembroke, convey him safely to the sea
But not in haste; for as we are advised,
We mean to be in France as soon as he,
To fortify such towns as we possess
In Anjou, Touraine and in Normandy.
(*The Troublesome Raigne.*)

Be thou as lightning in the eyes of France;
For ere thou canst report I will be there,
The thunder of my cannon shall be heard.
So hence! Be thou the trumpet of our wrath
And sullen presage of your own decay
(*King John.*)

Many readers will turn first to the comparatively brief note on 'The Copy for *Richard II*, 1597 and 1623'. The theory there stated is that of Dr Pollard (1916) modified to suit the subsequent suggestion of Dr McKerrow (1931) about the usual number, nature, and treatment of dramatic manuscripts. Instead of a single autograph manuscript adapted for use as a prompt book it supposes that there were two manuscripts from the start, a complete autograph from which the First Quarto was printed (with the omission of the 'deposition scene', iv, i, 154-318), and an equally complete transcript made for the prompter, which continued in theatrical use and was the source of the deposition scene and other

amendments in the copy of the Quarto of 1615 which was used by the printer of the Folio. The demonstration that this single hypothesis (of two manuscripts) solves a number of different problems is an encouraging sign that it is substantially on the right lines, although a little further tinkering may still be needed. Wilson refers for support to his notes on I, IV, 23 and 52-3, but the evidence there seems more easily explained on Pollard's original hypothesis of a single manuscript.

I am not sure how this 350-page volume with only 100 pages of text will strike the 'general reader' to whom the publishers address it, but specialized scholars will find it fully as instructive and challenging as its fellows.

A. K. McILWRAITH.

LIVERPOOL.

Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben, A Study of Classical Elements in the non-dramatic poetry of Ben Jonson and his Circle By KATHRYN ANDERSON McEUEEN. Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The Torch Press. 1939. xxix+316 pp. \$3.00.

The purpose of this study is to show how a knowledge of the chief classical poets coloured the outlook and shaped the writings of Jonson and his literary circle. The Roman poets chosen for illustration are Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Martial, Juvenal and Persius; the Greek poets are Pindar (with reference to the Pindaric Ode), Anacreon, and the writers in the Greek Anthology.

The book opens with an enumeration of the 'Tribe of Ben', briefly describing each of his sons. But several of those named in Dr McEuen's list have no right to be there. Corbet was a friend and companion, not a follower; Jonson knew him in his home and wrote an epitaph on his father. Sir Kenelm Digby was a patron rather than a dependent, the last man to be treated as a disciple. Suckling's references to Jonson are, as the author notes, depreciatory; he evidently did not come under the personal spell of Jonson. George Morley and Lord Clarendon are included in a note on page 261. Morley, Bishop of Winchester, visited Jonson on his deathbed and (presumably) administered the sacrament to him; there is no reason to think that he ever set foot inside The Devil Tavern. Jonson's early friendship with Clarendon cooled later, but, while it lasted, Mr Hyde was an equal, not a follower. Jonson's old servant and imitator, Richard Brome, and his warm admirer, Jasper Mayne, are not known to have been his 'sons', though they probably enjoyed his hospitality.

Apart from this initial defect the book is well put together. It is a scholarly and systematic examination of the evidence. Occasionally it has a tendency, inevitable perhaps in a work of this kind, to claim too much. Why need it be suggested that Herrick's epitaph on his spaniel Tracy 'may' have been influenced by the solitary epitaph on a dog in the Greek Anthology, especially as there is no verbal copying? Or when Herrick writes *To his Friend, on the untunable Times* of the Civil War, must he have turned to Catullus' poem on the death of his brother 'for

inspiration in expressing his mood of despondency'? The only inspiration reflected in the poem—

You see

My Harp hung up, here on the Willow tree—

is from the Psalm 'By the waters of Babylon', which gave utterance to a national rather than a personal grief. And it seems idle to suggest any connexion between the *Ambarvalia* poem of Tibullus and *The Hock-Cart, or Harvest Home* of Herrick, even if, at the latter, 'many healths were drunk, as by the Romans'. But usually the parallel passages and the evidence of adaptation are well to the point, and they range over a very wide field.

One point in Dr McEuen's treatment of metre calls for criticism. It concerns Jonson's use of enjambement and of the heroic couplet. Jonson's use of the stopped couplet, which was frequent, though not invariable, in his *Epigrams* and *Epistles*, was no doubt suggested to him by the pause at the end of the Latin elegiac couplet. But Dr McEuen goes further and explains that, when he ran on the sense from line to line, he was modelling the movement of the verse on Juvenal and the *Odes* of Pindar (pp. 270, 276). The idea is fantastic. 'Juvenal, who considered satire to be practically prose, was more daring than any other Latin poet, with the exception of Persius, in breaking up the rigid form of the hexameter.' Did Virgil never break up the hexameter with subtly modulated pauses which suggested so much to Milton in the rhythms of *Paradise Lost*? 'And so, when Jonson uses bold enjambements he is deliberately departing from the dignity of heroic verse in order to reach the flexibility of prose?' Cannot verse be flexible too? Is there to be no escape from monotony?

But in view of the general high quality of the book we do not wish to stress debatable points. The literary criticism is good, and the book as a whole is valuable and helpful.

It is also very accurate. The few errors we have noted are 'incipi' for 'mihi' on page 64, line 12; 'mulier' left out in the first line of Propertius quoted on page 130; and two misreadings in the Jonson quotations—'still'd', for 'stil'd' on page 211 (i.e. 'styled more swift'), and 'fil'd', for 'fil'd' on page 237 (i.e. 'filed upon record').

PERCY SIMPSON.

OXFORD.

Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger. By BALDWIN MAXWELL. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1939. x+238 pp. \$3.00.

Professor Baldwin Maxwell has done students a service by collecting his *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger*. Eight of them appear here for the first time; the nine others had been previously printed in various literary journals, some of which are not readily accessible in public or University libraries.

Ever since Fleay wrote his essay on *Metrical Tests as Applied to Dramatic Poetry*, the plays of these dramatists have been the happy

hunting-ground of the audacious guesser. Thus the title-page of *Cupid's Revenge*, acted 4 January 1612 and printed in 1615, asserts that the author was 'Iohn Fletcher'; a second edition (1630) tells us it was 'Written by Fran. Beaumont & Io. Fletcher'. Urged by a suggestion of Fleay's, critics have added the names of Daborne, Field and Massinger. One of Professor Maxwell's many merits is that his essays tend to decrease the confusion resulting from such diversity of conjecture; he gives little space to discussions on questions of authorship, and does not stress unduly the prevalence of play revision in Jacobean times. Another admirable characteristic of these essays is the judicious use made of his wide and detailed knowledge of the court and of contemporary history and social life, some of the dates suggested for the plays discussed are based on evidence gathered from the various Calendars of State Papers, Domestic and Venetian, manuscripts, letters, memoirs and ballads. By using this knowledge with caution and judgment he has made a substantial contribution to the formation of an acceptable chronological order for the plays in the Beaumont and Fletcher folios. This is notably true of his essays on *The Night-Walker*, *Love's Pilgrimage*, *Nice Valour*, *The Old Law* and *The Pilgrim*.

In the second part of his essay on *Henry VIII* he gives a masterly exposition of the logical defects inherent in Sykes's method of using parallel passages, and constructively sets out in detail what is necessary to prove that Massinger wrote part of the play. Four of the articles take a wider range. In his first essay he comes to the conclusions, first, that when a play has two titles this fact does not warrant the assumption that each title represents a different version of the play, next, that 'omissions and confusion in the dramatis personae are of no value in questions of revision' (p. 7) and, thirdly, that 'each play with a list [of actors] was acted by the company at a date at which the actors named were members of that company' (p. 13). Other interesting papers are those on *The Hungry Knave* and *The Attitude towards the Duello*. The book concludes with a brief but informative account of the prologues and epilogues found in the quartos and the two folios. Professor Maxwell has discovered that one epilogue was tagged to a tragedy though undoubtedly written for a comedy, and that another is not an epilogue but a prologue.

This book is valuable because the author's conclusions reach no further than the facts warrant; his thoroughness and disciplined scholarship are revealed on every page.

A. HART.

MELBOURNE.

Richard Crashaw. A Study in Baroque Sensibility. By AUSTIN WARREN. University, La.: Louisiana State University Press. 1939. xii+260 pp. \$3.00

During the last few years, in articles chiefly published in America, Mr Warren has been making very useful contributions to what is known about the life and poetry of Richard Crashaw. The results of these studies are succinctly given again in the present work, and they enable Mr

Warren to provide the fullest biography of the poet yet written. Among the novelties may be mentioned. (1) the discovery that the scholarship held by Crashaw at Cambridge entailed the regular composition of Latin and Greek verses on Scriptural subjects, the *Epigrammata Sacra* appearing to represent, in part, the carrying out of this obligation, (2) fresh light on the nature of Crashaw's duties as 'catechist', or theological tutor, at Peterhouse, and (3) new information about Crashaw's acquaintance with Joseph Beaumont, who shared and may have anticipated his friend's interest in St Teresa, since in a Latin oration of 1638 (MS.) he writes enthusiastically of her, adding in terms elaborated by Crashaw 'O how least a death would it be, in her writings to die!' Mr Warren enlarges, moreover, to very good purpose and with a scrupulous respect for accuracy, upon the known facts and personal influences in Crashaw's life.

More, however, than biography is offered, and something more valuable achieved. The attempt is made, again successfully, to relate Crashaw's mind and art to the devotional and aesthetic principles which informed the Counter-Reformation. Thus there is a chapter on 'Baroque Art and the Emblem' in which the agitated, eloquent, theatrical spirit of baroque painting, sculpture, and architecture is illuminatingly described and shown also largely to determine the temper and style of Crashaw's poetry. The highly sensuous exposition of religious beliefs, the widespread cult of visual indoctrination by *impresa* and emblem, and the pursuit of surprising analogies in epigram, paradox, or conceit are aptly adduced and illustrated. There is, of course, some indebtedness, duly acknowledged, to recent work by Professor Mario Praz, but here as elsewhere Mr Warren clearly manifests his own grasp and freshness.

Save for a brief concluding chapter on Crashaw's reputation the rest and major part of the volume is devoted to a study of Crashaw's poetry itself, the salient characteristics of his genius, and the qualities of particular poems or classes of poems. The inquiry is conducted on chronological lines, a discussion of the Latin epigrams being succeeded by accounts of the secular poems and translations, of the sacred poems in which Crashaw outdid Marino in fanciful tropes and embellishments, of the poetic treatment of certain specific Catholic themes, and of Crashaw's versification. A final section is concerned with Crashaw's distinctive habits in imagery or symbolism. The critical appreciations are discerning, sympathetic, and supported by comparisons and distinctions which give cogency and nuance to the arguments.

The work is admirably documented throughout and includes over thirty pages of notes, together with a useful bibliography. Altogether it is much to be commended for its combination of scholarship with sensitive and illuminating criticism.

L. C. MARTIN.

Milton's Literary Milieu. By G. W. WHITING. Durham: University of North Carolina Press. 1939. xiv + 401 pp. \$3 50.

This volume might have been more accurately entitled *Essays or Studies in Milton's Literary Milieu*. It consists of a series of studies setting forth, by means of exhaustive parallel quotations, the relation of Milton's writings to particular books and authors of his time. The main purpose is 'to show that a number of Milton's ideas, by some scholars attributed to specific sources, were shared by his contemporaries, some of whose works have been ignored or only cursorily examined in relation to Milton'. In this purpose of setting Milton more firmly in his own age Mr Whiting's book is effective; and it contributes valuable material to the larger, the vast subject of Milton's literary milieu.

The first part of the volume 'examines the relation of Milton's poetry to certain contemporary works or older works that were then available'. It includes a comparison of Milton's story of the creation with the accounts in three widely read works of the day—Raleigh's *History of the World*, Purchas's *Pilgrimage* and Hexham's translation of the Mercator-Hondius *Atlas*; an extensive citation of parallel passages from the three histories of Raleigh, Diodorus and Pliny, containing of course much material already noted by Milton scholars but also containing a number of new points of value, a chapter (one of the most interesting and informative) on Milton's use of maps, especially Ortelius's *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*; a refutation of Mr McColley's contention that Milton in his catalogue of the pagan deities relied on Ross's *Pansebeia*; evidence from contemporary Puritan pamphlets that 'the Civil War was often dramatized as a struggle between Satan and God, between Belial and Christ', leading to the thesis that Satan and Belial in *Paradise Lost* symbolized, among other things, the political forces against which Milton had striven; and an interesting suggestion that the 'dear wit and gay rhetoric' of Comus may owe something to Erasmus's *Encomium Moriae*. The second part of the volume 'analyses the relation of some of Milton's pamphlets to contemporary controversial writings'. It includes a number of chapters directed to showing that Milton from the start of his pamphleteering was at the centre of things and that his first tracts did not, as is generally thought, pass unnoticed: *Of Reformation* contains a direct reply to Digby's speech in the House of Commons on 9 February 1641; a pseudonymous tract dated 31 May 1641 is a reply to Milton's *Of Prelatical Episcopacy* (which further implies that Milton's first two tracts appeared earlier than the accepted dates); Lord Brooke in his tract on episcopacy drew on Milton's *Of Prelatical Episcopacy* and Milton in his *Reason of Church Government* drew in turn on Lord Brooke. Another chapter compares passages from *The Tenure of Kings* and John Canne's *Golden Rule*, in order to demonstrate that Milton was expressing the common opinions of his party; another shows that Milton in *Eikonoklastes* used May's *History and State Papers* for material which led Mr Lowenhaupt to argue that he had simply plagiarized *Eikon Alethine*.

Mr Whiting's book would have been shorter and better if he had reduced his commentary on the parallel passages, which form the sub-

stance of his book, to a minimum, and had left the evidence to speak more for itself. It would also have been better had he been content to let his series of studies prove what they can, not forcing the issues, not stretching them to the extent of general theories which they are insufficient to cover. There is one chapter in which he undertakes an interpretation of Milton's whole life and work on the basis of a comparative study of Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*. Milton's life is presented as a progress in melancholy (which we are assured, on authority, was the prevalent malady of the age); his poetry is then interpreted in the 'light' of this theory—from *Il Penseroso*, in which 'we observe the symptoms of the first stage of the disorder', to the fundamental pessimism which Mr Tillyard has discovered in the later books of *Paradise Lost* and the 'black despair' of *Samson Agonistes*. This chapter is not typical of the volume—indeed, it falls clean outside its proper province; yet it illustrates the author's unfortunate anxiety throughout to convince us that his book is something more, something more philosophical and organic, than a collection of particular, cognate studies.

B. A. WRIGHT.

SOUTHAMPTON.

The Life of Mrs Godolphin. By JOHN EVELYN. Edited by HARRIET SAMPSON. Oxford: University Press. 1939. xxxiii + 282 pp. 10s. 6d.

Margaret Godolphin, the wife of Sidney Godolphin, died in 1678. Her intimate friend, John Evelyn, composed his famous biography of this paragon of seventeenth-century piety and virtue soon after her death. Evelyn's biography, an excellent example of the short religious 'Life', which was one of the characteristic English literary forms of the period, was not printed till 1847. Bishop Wilberforce, who was responsible for the first three editions, used a holograph MS. which had been preserved by the Harcourt family, Evelyn's descendants, at Wotton. Subsequent editions of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including that of Sir Israel Gollancz which appeared in 1904, are all based on Wilberforce's text.

For her new edition Miss Harriet Sampson has used a second holograph which appears to be superior in almost every respect to the Harcourt MS. This holograph was given by Evelyn to Sidney Godolphin, and is now in the possession of Dr Rosenbach of Philadelphia. The Rosenbach MS. is much fuller than the version preserved at Wotton. It includes a Pindaric Ode written by John Evelyn junior, and a very interesting account of a visit by Mrs Godolphin to Elias Ashmole, neither of which appears in the Wilberforce-Harcourt editions.

Miss Sampson's edition of the Rosenbach MS. is an excellent piece of work and an important contribution to seventeenth-century studies. Besides a carefully edited text it includes a useful introduction, commentary, textual notes, several appendices and a biographical supplement together with a bibliography and a good index. Appendix B contains

interesting and hitherto unpublished material from MSS. by John Evelyn in the British Museum.

This will certainly be the definitive edition of a minor classic. Slips and omissions are rare. The author of the *Cyropaedia* appears rather queerly as 'Zenophon' on p. 209, and it is curious that the commentary gives no note on the words 'we should call it *Heaven on Earth, Paradise no longer Lost*' on p. 101. Surely this is a very early and interesting reference to Milton's poem.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

NOTTINGHAM.

The Unhappy Favourite, or The Earl of Essex. By JOHN BANKS. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by THOMAS M. H. BLAIR. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1939. xiii + 143 pp. + facsimile. 17s. 6d.

Professor Allardyce Nicoll has claimed that Banks was 'one of the most powerful forces in eighteenth-century tragedy' and that *The Unhappy Favourite* 'shows a decided attempt to produce a tragic spirit higher and more perfect than that of the heroic tragedy'. Mr Blair has been moved by such comments to reproduce in facsimile the first edition of 1682 and to attach an introduction and body of notes that exhaustively discuss all the topics that his ingenuity can connect with the text. One unfortunate result of this elaboration is that the would-be reader of Banks has to pay for this one play almost as much as a simple reprint of all seven of his tragedies would cost.

The Introduction includes a sketch of Banks's life and works, in which is stressed his eminence in the exploitation of the tearfully sentimental 'she-tragedy', as it has been called. His chief hope of any heroine is that 'she will draw Tears from the Fair Sexes Eyes'. Apparently he realized his hope in *The Unhappy Favourite*, 'in which', Steele noted in *The Tatler* after seeing a performance in 1709, 'there is not one good line, and yet a play which was never seen without drawing tears from some part of the audience'. From Fielding, however, it drew only laughter, as his parody in *Tom Thumb* suggests. The play is certainly not very moving when read; it is too long, too rhetorical, and too rarely enlivened by vigorous characterization and action. The various claims to historical significance which Mr Blair advances for it may justify his edition, but they will scarcely redeem Banks from the rank of playwrights whom it is 'work' to read.

F. E. BUDD.

LONDON.

Mr Cibber of Drury Lane. By RICHARD H. BARKER. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1939. 278 pp. 19s.

As the hero of Pope's *Dunciad* (1743) and a butt of Fielding in *Joseph Andrews*, Colley Cibber has endured a place in literature that apparently ill befits the character so persuasively drawn in his entertaining *Apology*.

Mr Barker, relieved by the lapse of two centuries from the need of extenuating or setting down aught in malice, has given us a straightforward, scholarly account of Cibber's life, from which the hero emerges with a convincing individuality to replace the dual personality of *The Dunciad* and the *Apology*. The evidence of such works is judiciously used, but it is supplemented by the ample material provided by recent research and by Mr Barker's own investigations at the Public Record Office.

Mr Barker makes no exalted claims for Cibber's own compositions. The Birthday and New Year odes which Cibber conscientiously ground out in his official capacity as laureate are dismissed at their true negligible value. In dealing with the plays which, with the help of unabashed solicitation of the proper aristocratic influences, won Cibber the laureateship, Mr Barker is, quite rightly, uninfluenced by Cibber's high reputation as a master of genteel comedy among his eighteenth-century successors. He recognizes Cibber's mediocrity in comedy when he is not plagiarizing from his abler contemporaries, and he calls attention to his more obvious weaknesses in tragedy, which have never been denied. To the *Apology* Mr Barker pays tribute for its brilliant review of the great Restoration actors and actresses whom Cibber had known in his youth, but he censures the lukewarmness of Cibber's treatment of his immediate fellows, the too favourable presentation of his own conduct, and the uncertain style. However, as a comprehensive and usually accurate account of a period of theatrical history it is allowed to be indispensable. One would gladly have approved a more enthusiastic estimate of the *Apology*.

The greater part of Mr Barker's volume is inevitably concerned with the complex and colourful history of the London theatres during the long period of Cibber's importance as actor, actor-manager, patentee and principal play-reader. Mr Barker lucidly records the intrigues and dissensions of the patentees and the actor-managers, the revolts and reunions of the companies, the rivalries of the theatres, the difficulties of playwrights, and the reactions of the public to the entertainment provided for it. Cibber was accorded his full share of the soft fruit and satire which served the age as means of critical expression. Growing personally unpopular with the theatre personnel and the public for a variety of reasons which Mr Barker explains, he came to be tolerated as an actor only in a few comic roles, and any play which he was suspected of having composed or revised stood a very good chance of being damned out of hand. In 1733 he made a strategic retirement from theatrical management, choosing an occasion highly advantageous to his own profit and extremely discomfiting to his disreputable son Theophilus, whose extraordinary activities, like those of his even more extraordinary sister, Charlotte Charke, are here amusingly touched upon.

Cibber's prolonged old age is the subject of an entertaining chapter. Until his death in 1757, aged 86, he continued to enjoy the pleasures of town and spa, to cultivate the aristocracy, to court the reigning toasts, and to dabble in literature as author, or friend of Richardson (whom he more often shocked than assisted by his suggestions for the improvements of his plots), or patron of such oddities as Mrs Pilkington and

Henry Jones, the bricklayer-poet. Neither the petty annoyances of the theatre nor the severe attacks of Dennis, Mist, Pope and Fielding, which Mr Barker admirably evaluates, had dulled his vivacity, and an increasing kindness renders the older Cibber a more likeable figure than the rather selfish coxcomb of the earlier years. If the Cibber who emerges from Mr Barker's lively pages lacks some of the qualities generously ascribed to him by Hazlitt, he is nevertheless a far more credible, competent and picturesque character than the hero of *The Dunciad*

F. E. BUDD.

LONDON.

Henry Crabb Robinson on Books and their Writers. Edited by EDITH J. MORLEY. London: Dent. 1938. 3 vols x+1136 pp. 31s 6d.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge. A Biographical Study. By E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1938. xvi+374 pp 18s.

Wordsworth and Coleridge. Studies in honor of George McLean Harper. Edited by EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. Princeton. University Press. 1939. viii+254 pp. 18s.

There are obvious links between these books, and taken with Dr de Selincourt's recently achieved task, the publication of the last volumes of the Wordsworth letters, they show the fruits of the last twenty years in the study of Wordsworth and Coleridge. All, in one way or another, return to the actual source, the first-hand evidence, and from this set out to correct misapprehensions and to establish the truth of the biography and the thought of the two poets, always with a strong sense of their relation to their time and their contemporaries.

Professor E. Morley's is of the three most obviously a source-book, containing every passage, with the exception of those already published in *Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Lamb*, in which Crabb Robinson refers to the English literature and English writers of his own time: a time extending from the publication of *John Gilpin*—he earned 6d. for learning it by heart—to Matthew Arnold's *Essays in Criticism*, which he was reading within a week of his death. The first two volumes contain the relevant extracts from his diary and reminiscences, the third a series of appendices, of which the first five include letters and excerpts from letters, from Carlyle to Crabb Robinson and from Crabb Robinson to various correspondents, the sixth a list of Literary References in his volume of Anecdotes and Memoranda, and the seventh, and for the painful researcher the most saving of labour, an Index to Mentions of (1) Writers, and (2) Books in the volumes of Crabb Robinson's correspondence preserved at Dr Williams's Library, all this in addition to the General Index. Much of the material has never been printed before, and much has been printed incorrectly; for Sadler felt all the freedom of a nineteenth-century editor to improve or condense without warning, and sometimes misread the MS. in addition. Anyone who has dealt with even a section of the immense Crabb Robinson piles of documents will appreciate the labour and care which Miss Morley has lavished on them, and in doubtful

readings will be prepared to accept her verdict. The self-portrait of Crabb Robinson is not changed from that with which first Sadler and then Miss Morley herself in her earlier editorial work have made us familiar: active in all the offices of friendship, a voracious and intelligent if not always discriminating reader, and insatiably curious about other men's political and still more their religious beliefs—it is pleasant, in the latest volumes of the Wordsworth letters, to find Wordsworth's comment on Crabb Robinson's religion, after reading here so many comments by Crabb Robinson on Wordsworth's, which Crabb Robinson could never reconcile with his own ideas of orthodoxy. In January 1845 Wordsworth wrote to Miss Fenwick:

Mr Robinson. . . is in his usually good spirits and health; deep in divinity, but he never seems to get any deeper, his mind every now and then coming up to the surface of what I cannot give a name to, for the state seems quite anomalous. He has however publicly professed himself a Unitarian, having been made to perceive that the wide embrace of that belief does not exclude Arianism — But all his aberrations of faith we can bear with for a hundred reasons and not least his love and admiration of you.

The mild criticism might apply to other activities of Crabb Robinson's mind, in which personal feelings played a stronger part than he himself ever realized. Thus, for instance, for Coleridge he felt, it is clear, at most an imperfect sympathy, dating perhaps from those embarrassing interviews when he acted as go-between in the reconciliation with Wordsworth, and some entries raise a suspicion that, but for his respect for the affection of Wordsworth and Lamb for Coleridge, imperfect sympathy would have swung over into frank dislike.

Sir E. K. Chambers also feels imperfect sympathy for Coleridge, and indeed if attention is concentrated on the outward events of Coleridge's life, imperfect sympathy is a natural if not an inevitable result. In this biography the facts are ascertained and marshalled with the accuracy and order which might be expected, and the effect is as depressing as might be expected. The facts are the least important things in Coleridge's life. 'The rapt One, of the godlike forehead, The heaven-eyed creature sleeps in earth.'

The last of the books in this list is a tribute to the scholar who, more than any other, has set in motion the Wordsworthian criticism of the present generation. Professor G. M. Harper is not forgotten in his own Festschrift, which contains an appreciation by Dr J. Duncan Spaeth and a bibliography compiled by Evelyn Griggs, but these occupy only a modest part of the volume, and that is probably much to Professor Harper's mind. There is a certain amount of hitherto unpublished material, in Dr de Selincourt's article on *Wordsworth and his Daughter's Marriage*, which supplements the passages in the *Letters*, in the Rev. Gerard Coleridge's editing of S. T. Coleridge's journals of tours in the Lake District in 1799 and 1802, and in the early defence of *Christabel*, probably written by Coleridge's friend Morgan in close consultation with Coleridge himself, which Mr E. L. Griggs contributes. Most of the Wordsworthian articles are critical considerations of his ideas: thus the late Emile Legouis discusses the *Lyrical Ballads* of 1798 with special

attention to the 'philosophical undercurrent' in Wordsworth's poems; Mr R. D. Havens writes on *Solitude, Silence and Loneliness in the Poetry of Wordsworth*, drawing his illustrations from *The Prelude*; Mr O. J. Campbell is in obvious and almost amusing disagreement with Mr N. P. Stallknecht, who writes on *The Tragic Flaw in Wordsworth's Philosophy* and has not seen as clearly into things as Mr Campbell. Mr B. R. McClellerry points out in letters of Coleridge to Byron what is in effect a first draft of the 'Preface' to *Christabel*, and Mr C. De Witt Thorpe discusses the meanings given to the word 'sublime' by Coleridge and Wordsworth. The remaining article on Coleridge is Miss Morley's *Coleridge in Germany* (1799), reprinted from *The London Mercury*, which shows Coleridge as energetic as he was later in the year, when he was in the Lake Country.

Two articles on minor figures form the waist of the volume, marking the transition from the Wordsworth to the Coleridge studies: M. Ray Adams on the likeable Helen Maria Williams, Samuel H. Monk on the less likeable Anna Seward, both children of the sentiment of the eighteenth century; but the second an odder figure, with less understanding of herself and her surroundings than the first. Helen Maria Williams is undoubtedly more at home in the company of Wordsworth and Coleridge, even if she does not entirely deserve an 'upper seat in Purgatory'. And at least it is certain that she met the Wordsworths in 1820, whereas no one is likely ever to know whether they met the Swan of Lichfield, since the recollections of Dorothy and William were in flat contradiction and Scott, who might have settled the question, was tactfully forgetful. Or can Professor Harper himself, who has added so much to our knowledge of Wordsworth's life, decide this one small point?

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

Jane Austen and her Art. By MARY LASCELLES. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1939. xi+225 pp. 10s. 6d.

Jane Austen's quality as an artist has been recognized by all, or almost all, the critics who have written of her; it has been left for Miss Lascelles to examine it in detail, and she has carried through the task with the skill and acumen we have learnt to expect from her. As foundation for her critical work Miss Lascelles gives a brief biography, followed by a chapter showing the various ways—quotation, allusion, burlesque—in which Jane Austen's reading reappears in her writing. A chapter on style and its development between the earlier and later novels, mainly a reproduction of her masterly essay in vol. xxii of *Essays and Studies*, brings Miss Lascelles to her main subject, the particular problems of the narrator in selecting and arranging his material and in conveying his meaning to the reader, and the way in which Jane Austen solves these problems. Miss Lascelles examines and develops suggestions thrown out by Professor Saintsbury, Lord David Cecil and others; she shows how it is that, though Jane Austen's range is limited, her vision is not falsified thereby: 'holding with steady consistency to a clear and precise scale of

moral values' (p. 135), she keeps things in their right proportion and maintains the right relationship between the facts of her imaginary world and those of the real world. The narrative patterns of the novels vary, and the skill with which they are handled increases, with consummate tact she keeps almost exclusively to the point of view of the heroine, gaining unity of impression, and more and more she leaves the communication of fact to be made by the characters themselves, consciously or unconsciously, with just the right amount of emphasis, one may learn much, for instance, from 'the limpid confusion of Miss Bates's talk' (a delightful phrase). Is not Darcy's 'flamboyant rudeness' also explained in this unemphatic way? Miss Bingley makes it clear (ch. XI) that to Darcy a ball is 'rather a punishment than a pleasure'; he is resentful of being dragged to one so soon after his arrival at Netherfield, and so is 'above being pleased' and fails to realize that his reply to Bingley may be overheard.

Miss Lascelles finds the essence of Jane Austen's comedy in incongruity, 'disparity between act and retribution, between being and seeming' (p. 140), and between apprehension and reality, as indeed is suggested in *Pride and Prejudice* and at the end of *Mansfield Park*. She further points out that, while Jane Austen always represents faithfully the material she includes, she allows herself to exclude what is alien to her comedy. 'Her most obvious exclusion is that of death', which approaches nearest in the death of Mrs Churchill. This is natural; death is not a comic subject, and Jane Austen would not treat it as such, though she finds the right words to describe its repercussions in *Highbury*, and she had planned to bring it more centrally into the plot of *The Watsons*, the discontinuance of which may have been due to a connexion in her mind between her own father's death and that of Mr Watson rather than to an avoidance of death in itself. She does not avoid the equally serious subject of seduction, though Miss Lascelles finds that she had an 'instinctive dissatisfaction' with it (p. 73), and always treated it conventionally—a suggestion which is open to question.

A few points of detail call for special comment. It is perhaps worth noting in passing that, while many critics agree that Jane Austen has failed in the presentation of some of her characters, they differ as to which characters are unsuccessful, suggesting that the failure may be in perception rather than in delineation. I have never felt, for instance, that there is 'more than one Mrs Jennings' (pp. 150, 200), but only that she, like Darcy, 'improves on acquaintance'. Nor can I agree that Charlotte Palmer is no sillier than Harriet Smith (p. 151). Harriet has been cured of her school-girl's giggle; moreover she is younger, and has qualities which lead Mr Knightley to predict that 'in good hands she will turn out a valuable woman'. Occasionally Miss Lascelles is betrayed into excessive subtlety. Why suggest that 'ordination' is used, in a letter to Cassandra, to symbolize the discordant scales of values of Edmund and Fanny and the Crawfords, only to conclude that this use is not effectual (p. 136)? Why may not the word bear its literal meaning? Cassandra was at Steventon, and had presumably been commissioned to make some

enquiry of her brother James relative to the actual ordination service. Again, Edward Ferrars' objection to blasted trees and ruined cottages is a retort to Gilpin, not to Scott, in the passage quoted from *Marmion* (p. 16) Scott is emphasizing the force of early associations, and is in effect praising the Devonshire landscape and taking Edward's view of it. A few misprints also have escaped correction: the dates 1803 for 1801 (p. 17) and 1770 for 1750 (p. 211), *interests* for *interest* (p. 185), and *these* dropped between pages 144 and 145.

These are, however, small points, and do not affect the main lines of Miss Lascelles' analysis. The book is one to be studied by all lovers of Jane Austen, and all will find their appreciation quickened by it.

WINIFRED HUSBANDS.

LONDON.

The History of the English Novel. Vol. x. *Yesterday*. By ERNEST A. BAKER. London: Witherby. 1939. 420 pp. 16s.

Dr Baker's tenth, and concluding, volume completes what he himself calls 'an enormous task' which, as he proceeded with it, swelled far beyond the proportions of his original intentions. It is the fruit of a lifetime of omnivorous critical reading and of many years of teaching by the former Director of the School of Librarianship in University College, London. Dr Baker is to be congratulated on bringing such a task to its appointed end, with the courage and perseverance ingrained in the veteran and distinguished rock-climber who is the author's second avatar.

The present volume begins with Conrad and ends with D. H. Lawrence, and is divided into eight chapters, each devoted to outstanding novelists or groups of novelists. The plan of the book opposes itself in some measure to any continuous study of development and evolution. But, indeed, Dr Baker in his concluding observations upon Lawrence declares his conception of the supreme importance of individuals and their influence. While no one could deny the partial truth that lies in this conception of literary history, we should nevertheless have welcomed, and indeed expected at the end of a final volume, some retrospective survey in broad outlines of the main stream of English fiction. And it is disappointing not to have from Dr Baker, with his exceptional knowledge, some analysis of present trends.

Dr Baker, again, might find some difficulty in reconciling this individualistic point of view with such general concepts as prevail in his criticism. He has, for instance, a concept of the true nature of a 'novel' which bisects Conrad into two chapters, the 'Teller of Tales' and the 'Novelist', and forbids him to accept Kipling's *Kim* as a true 'novel'. It is 'a story'. And Dr Baker fortifies himself with the support here of Mr Dixon Scott, as elsewhere by Mr Hubert Bland's 'thorough dislike' of the Puck books, or by Mr Herbert Read, or other authorities equally inferior to his own.

In several ways, indeed, the plan of the book may seem to be unfortunate. Its sectional arrangement leads to the distribution of large space to

a few names, with many consequent omissions. One is surprised, for instance, to find no mention whatever of Maurice Hewlett, while Conan Doyle, whose Sherlock Holmes was born about the same time as *Almayer's Folly*, appears once only in passing on p. 51. The odd thing is that women novelists come off better in this respect, by the chance that they are dealt with in an omnibus chapter in which Katherine Mansfield and 'the industrious' Mrs Oliphant share the honours. Dr Baker's view that the sex of women writers marks them off into a true group might well cause discontent among them. So with the Irish and Scots groups.

The 'English Novel', it is clear, is defined to exclude the American novel or other novels in English not written in England. It is, however, an obviously artificial definition, when one considers that the Pole, Conrad, fills two chapters and more than a quarter of the whole book, while Henry James the American, also a naturalized Englishman, is relegated to footnotes.

Our conclusion may be, in general, that *Yesterday* is still too close to us for true perspective or for the criticism of scholarship. The shadow of politics rests upon Kipling's work in Dr Baker's mind, and the warmth of some of his appreciations is in fact an unconscious tribute to friendship. It could not be otherwise. It is part of his just claim to speak with an authority which all who wish to study his subject must salute.

C. J. SISSON.

LONDON.

Brân the Blessed in Arthurian Romance. By HELAINE NEWSTEAD. New York. Columbia University Press; London: Milford, Oxford University Press. 1939. 222 pp. 17s. 6d.

This volume is a well-documented corollary to *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance* (1927) by Roger Sherman Loomis, but it deals almost exclusively with the question of origins, and is but indirectly concerned with the nature and 'meaning' of the material used. Accepting the general thesis that many proper names and episodes in continental Arthurian texts are ultimately derived, through Breton *conteurs*, from a floating mass of Celtic myth and folklore which circulated in Wales, Miss Newstead has endeavoured to show that the Welsh traditions of Brân are the source, not only of the name and character of Bron, the Rich Fisher, in Robert de Boron's *Roman de l'Esloire dou Graal*, but also of other figures and incidents in French, German and Latin versions of the Grail story. The majority of the derivations of proper names adopted in this book have been proposed by Loomis, Nitze, Cross, Brown and others who regard the Grail traditions as mainly Celtic in origin. In fact, Miss Newstead defines her task as that of 'surveying the most significant texts and gathering from them the evidence for the hypothesis already advanced by these scholars'. These are strange words: scholars are generally expected to gather and weigh their evidence before formulating any theory of explanation.

In a study of this kind, where Welsh tradition is used to throw light on

continental texts, it is important that the interpretation of the Welsh evidence be absolutely correct. Unfortunately, native tradition does not tell us very much about the Blessed Brân (Bendigeidfran). Our best source is 'Branwen, the Daughter of Llŷr', the second of the four Mediaeval Welsh tales known as 'The Four Branches of the *Mabinogi*'. In Chapter II Miss Newstead recapitulates the pertinent parts of that tale, and tabulates the facts concerning Brân which can be deduced from the incidents and characters, adding other details from a list of the 'Thirteen Treasures of the Isle of Britain', a few early Welsh poems, two late Welsh triads, and Welsh topography. It appears that Miss Newstead has acquired some knowledge of Welsh, and that she is not altogether dependent on translations. It is all the more surprising, therefore, that she seems to have given no consideration to the illuminating notes of Professor Ifor Williams in his critical edition of the *Mabinogi*.¹ More especially, his notes² on the difficult phrase 'Ysbydawl Urdaul Benn' should have shown that these words do not necessarily mean 'The Hospitality of the Noble Head'. One looks in vain for a reference to the same editor's opinion³ that *Bendigeid* and *urdaul*, as applied to *Brân* and *pen* respectively, are inappropriate, and that they have replaced older forms which were not understood by the story-teller or the copyist. Every possible interpretation of the Welsh texts should be placed before the reader.

The following is another point to illustrate how the author is handicapped by insufficient knowledge of Welsh. 'Brân Galed o'r Gogledd' is identified, rightly or wrongly, with Brân the Blessed, and the 'Horn of Plenty' attributed to the former is naturally connected with the joyous and ageless feasts associated with the latter. On p. 149 Miss Newstead labours to prove that the evil nature of Brandus des Isles (a name plausibly derived from Bran, dus des Isles), in the Vulgate *Lancelot*, is due to his rôle in an imprisonment story. This ingenious explanation is foisted upon the reader because not one of the scholars who have written, with such a display of learning, on 'Corn Brân Galed' and the traditions of feasting and of plenty associated with Brân, has understood the meaning of the adjective *caled* (the radical form of *galed*) in the former's name. 'Brân Galed' does not mean 'Brân the Hard (or Hardy)', but rather 'Brân the Niggard (or the Miser)'. 'Miserly', 'niggardly' is a well-authenticated meaning of *caled*.⁴ That the adjective was thus understood in Brân's name is proved by the following lines⁵ by Guto'r Glyn, a Welsh poet of the fifteenth century:

Brân Galed brin y gelwynt
Bonedd Gwŷr y Gogledd gynt;

¹ *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi*. . . . Ifor Williams (Caerdydd, Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1930).

² *Op. cit.*, 220-2.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ J. Lloyd-Jones, *Geirfa Barddoniaeth Gynnar Gymraeg*, II, 98, s.v. 'calet' Cf. Henry Lewis, *Darn o'r Ffestival* (London, 1925), 151: Eithr yr oedd ef mor *galed* ac na roe ef ddim y neb a ddele atto y gaissio ('But he was so *niggardly* that he would not give anything to anyone who would come to him to make a request').

⁵ Ifor Williams a J. Ll. Williams, *Gwanth Guto'r Glyn* (Cardiff, 1939), lxxxii, 61-6 (p. 218).

Taliesin, ddewin ddiwael,
 A'i troes yn well no'r tri hael.
 Un fodd a hwnnw fyddaf,
 Troi'n well dy natur a wnafl¹

I do not maintain that *caled*, as applied to Brân, and the lost tradition to which these lines refer, necessarily explain Brandus's evil nature, but I am tempted to suggest that had Miss Newstead grasped the full meaning of 'Brân Galed' and been acquainted with the above words of Guto r Glyn, she would have seen in them an explanation of the phrase 'cibos interdicente' in the anecdote² which Pierre Bercheur includes in his *Reductorium morale*, and of the 'homo quidam staturae similis giganteae'³ who prevents the unnamed hero of the Arthurian tale in Capellanus's *De Amore*. ii, cap viii, from partaking of the sumptuous dishes which he finds in the fair meadow. Her explanation might be correct, but it could hardly be proved to be so.

References are made⁴ to two Welsh triads as supplying details of the Welsh traditions of Brân. It is admitted that they occur in the 'Third Series' and are, therefore, regarded with suspicion. It is argued, however, that they are of significance as being 'evidently independent of the French romances in which Bron appears'. Independent of the French romances they may be, but they are certainly not independent of Iolo Morganwg, that most successful Welsh literary forger of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

In an attempt to show that Beli, like Brân, was originally a god of the sea, the expressions *Biw Beli* ('the cattle of Beli') and *Gwirawt Veli* ('the liquor of Beli') are quoted, on the authority of Anwyl and MacCulloch, as synonymous with the waves and the brine respectively. However, the former expression occurs but once,⁵ and Professor Ifor Williams⁶ is unwilling to accept Anwyl's interpretation as final. The second expression also is confined to one example.⁷ Such evidence is hardly sufficient to warrant the conclusion that Beli was connected with the sea.

In a study of literary origins, especially in a field as wide as that of Arthurian romance, absolute proof is well-nigh impossible. It can be said of this book, however, that it contains a sane, if not always convincing, treatment of a difficult subject, and that the author has made out a plausible case for regarding the Welsh stage in the Brân traditions as an explanation of many elements in the continental Grail texts.

THOMAS JONES.

ABERYSTWYTH.

'Miserly, Niggardly Brân they used to call him who of old was descended from the Men of the North; Taliesin, no mean magician, transformed him into one better than the three generous men. Like him shall I be, I shall transform thy nature into a better one.'

² See p. 76.

³ See pp. 141-2.

⁴ Pp. 21, 44, 162.

⁵ *The Book of Aneirin*, ii, 2: Ysgwyt vrw rac biw beli bloedvawr.

⁶ *Canu Aneirin* (Caerdydd, 1938), 181-2

⁷ *The Book of Taliesin*, 30, 26: Gnwrt rwyf yn heli bel wirawt.

Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature. Presented to Professor MILDRED K. POPE by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends. Manchester University Press. 1939. xiv+429 pp. 25s.

The name of this *Review* appears so often in Miss Pope's bibliography that it shows she has always been aware of the main need of Modern Language studies among us—to integrate foreign thought into ours and to make our thoughts a distinctive contribution to the culture of other lands. Her pupils, with their remarkable unity of outlook and method, are proof of her clear lines of direction; and uncounted other Somervillians are debtors for her tuition, which was marked by the extreme of care and kindness. Not as an agitator but as an exemplar, her rôle bears comparison with any in the history of women's recent advance toward the higher learning; and in her haven of Manchester, entering into an untried relationship between teacher and taught, Professor Pope showed unabated zest and delight. The biographical interest transcends the rather meagre limits of the short note in this volume, and deserved a fuller statement. Perhaps her colleagues of Somerville will one day repair this defect.

Thanks to its remarkable uniformity and merit this book is a major contribution to Old French studies. It is a conference of working editors and the cautious sort of philologists. The largest contribution, however, is the work of a dissenter. Professor Orr, under cover of a dialogue between Orthos (himself) and Rectus, is at pains to establish his, so to say, 'Orr-thodoxy'. Rectus is a 'young grammarian', well informed in facts, who has apparently ceased to reflect on principles after a glance at Saussure. Orthos first bewilders him with a drumfire of instances of homonymic conflict, and then propounds principles of 'associative etymology'; he ends by considering the special case of *esmer*. But is there not a good deal of shadow-boxing in this? Surely few philologists are inclined to contest the importance of mental associations, but many doubt individual instances and hesitate to make leaps without more light of evidence. 'Associative etymology' inevitably tends to make phonetic laws into *privilegia*, applicable to isolated cases only. When a *privilegium* is contested, where do we turn for assurance? Orthos says that the treatment of *h* in *le héros* is due to the wish to avoid a homonymic conflict between *les héros* and *les zéros*; Professor Spitzer says it is not so. How can we decide? The alleged difficulty of distinguishing between a hero and zero exists as an unsupported allegation. A process for heresy is not likely to be levelled against Orthos's master Gilliéron, but at this date, when the dust of his battles is laid, we find his use of paradox and metaphor and his provocative language a source of confusion.

Faith in 'scientific' principles of editing was shaken several years ago by Joseph Bédier. Professors Ewert and Vinaver seek to restore some credit to mechanical aids. The latter establishes four classes of error according to the movements of the eye along the lines of the original, from original back to copy, along the lines of the copy, and back to the original. Professor Ewert takes up the particular case of the Bérout scribe. He had a number of bad habits. The editor who clears up the con-

sequences of those habits can feel sure he is restoring the original. The argument is to some extent circular, since the knowledge of these faults comes from completing the edition. The editor who has just finished his task is just qualified to begin it again on secure lines.

By an irony of the alphabet Miss E. A. Francis demolishes one of Professor Hœpfner's parallels immediately before Professor Hœpfner constructs another. He works out the connexion between *Eliduc* and *Ille et Galeron*, arguing for direct association. The trial scene in *Lanval*, which has points of resemblance to the trial of Daire in the *Roman de Thèbes*, is shown by Miss Francis to consist mainly of versified legal formulas. To identify, as Professor Fawtier does, the phrase 'ne valt iij deniers' (*Roland* 1880) with 'une des charges caractéristiques de la condition servile, le chevage', is perhaps to allow ingenuity to outrun discretion. The same essayist shows that the letter described in *Roland* 485-7 is a *lettre close*, a kind of document otherwise unattested before the thirteenth century. Among the secondary forms of the lyric, described by M. Jeanroy, is the *viandela*, of which more will be heard. The resemblance to the Galician-Portuguese *cossante* is striking, and encourages him to adopt a hypothesis of Portuguese origin. There are also several slight differences which, in so naive a genre, may have to be used against the hypothesis.

Texts edited or discussed include the *Femina nova*, *Le dit des trois signes*, *Des granz geants*, Trevet, Douce MS. 252, *Les Narbonnais*, a French translation of the Pseudo-Turpin, *Boeve de Hamtone*. The fragments of an assonating *Narbonnais*, published by Gweneth Hutchings (to use the signature here employed), carry Suchier's text of that cyclic romance to an earlier and, it would seem, a more virile state. It is a discovery of great interest. Professor Watkins relates a singular history of misunderstandings on that slippery ground where Romance and Celtic scholars meet. The editor of *Boeve de Hamtone* (A. Stimming) consulted the Welsh translation as edited by a Welsh erudite, who knew nothing of French and little of scholarly method. To make assurance doubly sure Stimming consulted a Celtic scholar, weak in Welsh and with no direct knowledge of the manuscript. The result was a manifold imbroglio. There is probably a moral for editors in this history, though the best I can draw is that no one can safely ask a scholarly question unless he can himself supply the answer.

Linguistic problems and details give cause for about a dozen articles, of which the most ambitious is Mr R. C. Johnston's wrestle with $\phi > [o]$ in free syllables. Miss Paton removes Fr. *aller* from the ANDARE group, I think rightly (but I do not see why OFr. *aner* should be explained by *aller*). She proposes the etymon *ALLARE < ALLATUS. It is difficult in itself, and not well buttressed by a quotation from Vergil. By attributing the choice of past tenses in Old French texts to the different demands of recited and read literature, Mrs Sutherland moves suggestively on the borderline of linguistics and aesthetics. Teachers who have to deal with the periodic style may find Professor Webster's diagrams helpful. They aim at displaying pictorially the architecture of the sentence.

The editors have imposed stricter rules on Oxford contributors than on those from Manchester. Professor Charlton deals with a Renaissance theme. In an amusing article he shows that the story of Romeo and Juliet, by passing through France on its way to England, gained decorum. Mr Wilenski finds some likeness between the capitals at Moissac and the winged bulls of Nineveh. Miss Dominica Legge writes in pious memory of William Kingsmill, teacher of French at Oxford in the fifteenth century. French at Oxford seems to be junior to Latin but senior to Greek—which is a paradox in connexion with a 'new subject'! Canon Carlyle's study of constitutional principles in France in the days of growing absolutism has a topical interest in these days of Franco-British intimacy. Beneath differences of emphasis there has always been the same content of political thought. When France began to admire the English constitution, she doubtless did so for good French reasons.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

La Folie Tristan d'Oxford. Publiée avec commentaire par ERNEST HÖPFFNER. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 1938. 178 pp. 20 francs.

M. Höpffner's edition of the Oxford *Folie* (Fo) follows closely on the lines of his edition of the Berne *Folie* (Fb), published in the same series in 1934, and, as is natural in the treatment of two such allied subjects, it contains some material that is similar and almost identical. Once again he rejects the hypothesis of a common source for the two *Folies*, and reiterates his theory that Fo is a courtly *renouvellement* of Fb, and concludes that Fo stands in the same relationship to Fb as Thomas to Béroul. With regard to the relationship of Fo to Thomas, he points out the many similarities between them, and excuses their differences on the grounds of poetic inspiration on the part of the author of Fo; in the Husdent episode he shows that this poet followed the narrative of Fb rather than that of Thomas. In speaking of the other literary sources of Fo, M. Höpffner is less convincing. The direct influence of Wace is not proved by the absence in the derivatives of Thomas of the description of Tintagel and of Carlion, and the contention of M. Bédier cannot in this way be disproved.¹ Likewise, M. Höpffner gives no sufficient proof as to why it was the poet of Fo who imitated Marie de France, and not vice versa, for he has not established the date of either poem. In fact, any discussion of the date of Fo is omitted from this book. The section on the language adds a few points to M. Bédier's study; those on the versification and style bring out clearly the resemblance between Thomas and the poet of Fo. With regard to the identity of this poet, M. Höpffner ends with a pessimistic note, for although it seems to him that it might have been Thomas himself, 'le doute subsiste'.

It is unfortunately the major premise of M. Höpffner's Introduction that is the least convincing. Although he states that he is now more

¹ 'Or nous savons qu'en maintes occasions Thomas a pris des vers à Wace. Comme il est très invraisemblable que l'auteur de la *Folie* ait eu la même idée, c'est Thomas qui est l'auteur premier du plagiat....' *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas*, S.A.T.F., I, 7, n. 1.

assured of the fact that Fo is derived from Fb, and that they do not both go back to a common source, he has no more real proof of this hypothesis than he had in 1934. It is interesting to note that he has omitted any comment on v. 813 where Tristan refers to his *guages*. As M. Bédier pointed out in his glossary: 'Il s'agit comme on voit par le poème de Béroul du désir, exprimé par Tristan, que le roi paye les dettes par lui contractées chez son *oste*.' Now this particular motive is absent from Fb. If Fb is the direct source of Fo, its presence in this poem can only be explained (according to M. Hoëpfner's table), by the influence of Thomas. But this incident was included by M. Bédier in his reconstruction of Thomas because it is found in Fo and perhaps in *Sir Tristrem*. The precise meaning of the English verse is uncertain,¹ and, therefore, it is primarily on the evidence of Fo that Bédier has included it, although it is not in Gottfried. There is then no proof that it was contained in Thomas, and if it were not in that poem, M. Hoëpfner's table of relationships could not stand. Fo must have had recourse to the common version of the Tristan legend as represented by Béroul and Eilhart for his information. It therefore follows that Fb cannot be the intermediate version between Fo and Béroul, for these two have something in common which is not found in Fb, and, therefore, Fb cannot be the direct source of Fo.

The text of M. Hoëpfner's edition is important in that it justifies in many instances the reading of the manuscript. Of the divergences between his edition and that of M. Bédier of which he gives a list, pp. 44-5, he is unfortunately mistaken over v. 198. The MS. reads *mens* and not, as he corrects, *men*. There are two misprints: *volum* occurs at v. 82 and not 42; v. 972 should read 973. The text itself shows great inconsistency in the method of noting variants, and in the use of italics, in the notes, to mark the resolution of the abbreviations of the MS. The following lines contain misreadings of the MS., and should be corrected as follows: 21 n.: ke il *sa* soust; 184: *greinur*, n.: Je le; 286: *merveille*; 338 n.: *venim*; 419: *des cors* (omitted in notes); 429: *bain*; 449 n.: *acordai*; 465 n.: *vus* is written exactly as the *vus* of the preceding and following lines; 579 n.: *alunnez*; 792: MS. has clearly *swiez*; 835, 854, nn.: *s* is the letter expunctuated; 857: *cel*; 884: gaunt; 982 n.: vis ki. In lines 159 and 188, M. Hoëpfner has corrected the MS. and failed to give the original readings. These should be: 159, *prat*; 188, *mausum*. Throughout the text he corrects the MS. spelling *Marc*, etc. to *Mark*, etc. The position of l. 278 is not correctly noted. It is written across both columns in the top margin on the ink-ruled bounding line. In several places in the notes the number of syllables in a faulty line is incorrectly given or entirely omitted. All mention of the alineas in the MS. is omitted for the following lines: 271, 367, 415, 689, 979, whereas the others are noted.

GWENETH HUTCHINGS.

OXFORD.

¹ *Sir Tristrem*, ed. George P. McNeill, Scottish Text Society, 1886, vv. 2136-8:

pou praye þe king for me,
 3if it þi wille ware
 Of *sake* he make me free.

Both E. Kolbing and McNeill interpret *sake* as 'guilt'.

Romanticism in France. By N. H. CLEMENT. New York Modern Language Association of America (Revolving Fund Series, ix). 1939 xviii+495 pp. \$3.

This book reopens the familiar debate: is literary criticism an art or a science? Should we interpret literature as a more or less haphazard collection of human documents, of the thoughts of certain men, each of whom is an interesting study in himself, or should we tabulate it as a number of symptoms of the evolution of human society, as the intertwining of many genres and motifs the existence of which is due, not to the whims of any individual, but to such factors as social conditions, political history or economic struggles? Is a writer a free agent or merely a social symptom?

When all is said and done, it seems to be the critic's own temperament that draws him towards the methods of Sainte-Beuve or Taine, Lemaître or Brunetière. Mr Clement clearly leans towards the scientific conception. The principal claim of his book is set out in the foreword as follows:

It seemed to me that if the *internal* history of romanticism were written, with the stress laid on *ideas*, and not on authors and works, if its study were approached from the dynamic, or historical and evolutionary, point of view rather than from the static ... a new insight might be gained into the romantic movement

The scientific method of the whole book is seen in the highly complicated first chapter, entitled 'Reason—Imagination—Feeling—Will', in which the author affirms that 'classical literature is the product of a harmonious combination of reason, feeling and will', where 'will' is synonymous with conscious striving towards technical perfection. Romantic art, on the other hand, is said to be the product of these same ingredients, but with feeling greatly increased, will (or discipline) diminished, and imagination, subdivided by Mr Clement into various types, added. All this is fairly obvious as a generalization, but one may well ask whether Mr Clement, in accepting at its own valuation the Romantics' claim that their art 'gushed forth spontaneously from a pure inspiration above all earthly control', has not swallowed the bait so skilfully set by these seemingly natural artists. For, to take only the great poets, it is surely clear that in spite of their claims to untrammelled divine inspiration they really set very great store by the most careful planning of the work as a whole and minute attention to every detail. In argument, design, construction, versification and musical values a Hugo poem is thought-out to the last syllable, the lyrical outpourings of Musset are in reality carefully wrought exercises in rhetoric, while even the simplest-looking meditation of Lamartine is a good deal less artless than its author would have us believe.

The body of the book consists of many carefully subdivided and exhaustively treated themes, genres, tendencies, motifs and attitudes which are followed out from the end of the classical period, through the eighteenth century and on into the romantic period proper. These topics include almost every conceivable manifestation of romanticism. For example, after a chapter on the development of sensibility and imagina-

tion through the eighteenth century, chapter III, on Preromanticism, has sections on Ossianism, Nordic myths, medievalism, wonder, terror and the fantastic, melancholy, nature, the Bible, and Hellenism. Chapter IV, on Types of French Romanticism, has divisions on religious feeling, political liberalism, Saint-Simonism, Fourierism and other social panaceas. Chapter V, Romantic Genres, follows drama from classical tragedy to the *drame romantique*, and deals equally fully with the novel and lyrical poetry. Chapter VI, Romantic Motifs, deals similarly with religious yearning, love, nature and the function of the poet. And so on through chapters on Romantic Moods, Romantic Characters, Romantic Individualization and Primitivism.

Such a method provides, as it were, a system of signposted routes through the forest of one hundred and fifty years of literature. Its advantages are many and clear. But there are also the drawbacks that while you are following out one route you cannot see any of the others, that the many routes often intersect and overlap and that at no time can you get a bird's-eye view of the forest as a whole. Hence three dangers not always avoided in this book—the temptation to systematize motifs and types of literature and treat them as though they were living organisms having an independent existence: this leads to labelling and pigeonholing; the influence of the ready-made theories of the author on his choice, arrangement and suppression of matter: this leads to misplaced emphasis and even to contradictions; the tendency, since no writer confines himself to one motif or mood, to spread separate and often in themselves insignificant aspects of a man's work over many sections of the book. This leads to much repetition and a diffuseness that makes it difficult to assess the value and importance of any one author. An instance of the first of these dangers has already been given, one of the second is that the eighteenth-century *philosophes* are treated in one context as 'desiccated rationalists' and in another as examples of sensibility (both statements are true, but as expressed here they are likely to confuse the student), while, as instances of the third, there are many cases of repetition, involving chronological obscurity, or of dealing with the same thing under slightly different headings, as when the Romantic's feeling of isolation is discussed in the chapter on Romantic Moods and his consciousness of his singularity is examined under Romantic Characters.

But all this does not mean that this is a bad book. On the contrary, almost all its parts are very well done. If, taken as a whole, it does not fulfil the first claim of the foreword, which is to give a definition of French romanticism (for a closely-written series of analyses of scores of genres and tendencies and hundreds of works, running into nearly five hundred pages, can scarcely be called a definition), that is probably because romanticism cannot be defined, any more than electricity. But, like those of electricity, its workings can be tabulated. The method adopted here, that of taking longitudinal sections of the period, defeats its own object if that object is to give a clear vision of the period as a whole, since the reader is continually being brought back to the beginning again. But if the book is considered as a series of essays on types and

aspects of romanticism it is completely successful. Each section is fully documented, illustrated with a wealth of quotations and set out in a lucid and attractively written argument. The variety of ingredients and richness of erudition might make Mr Clement's work heavy and indigestible fare for the young student who would be well advised to take it in small quantities and ruminate. But for the teacher it is full of telling arguments backed by examples, most of which are apt and very few of which are hackneyed.

L. W. TANCOCK.

LONDON.

Dictator of Portugal. A life of the Marquis of Pombal, 1699-1782. By MARCUS CHEKE. London. Sidgwick and Jackson. 1939. viii + 315 pp. 12s. 6d.

Mr Cheke has used trustworthy printed sources and has produced an acceptable portrait of the man who once attracted the extremes of praise and censure. His efforts at impartiality give his book an advantage over the other English biography by John Smith, secretary to Marshal Saldanha, Pombal's grandson (1843, reprinted 1871). The nature of Pombal's rule is correctly summed up in the title, for he dominated the indolent King Joseph and gave no initiative to colleagues and subordinates, but the benefits he conferred on the country during his administration of twenty-seven years were outweighed by his ill-planned reforms and such cruelties to opponents or critics as Portugal had not known before. His models were out of date, Richelieu in politics, Sully in economics. With his despotic temper and undoubted patriotism Pombal could not admire England, where he began his career as Minister, all the more as his time was spent in seeking redress for Portuguese grievances, and in February 1742 he threatened Walpole with a breach of diplomatic relations. But he envied English prosperity and when in power greatly diminished the control of Portuguese trade exercised by the English Factory in Lisbon. To this achievement may be added others: the abolition of slavery in Portugal and of the distinction between Old and New Christians, his encouragement of the middle class, partly through hatred of the nobles, and the rebuilding of Lisbon after the earthquake of 1755. But he only began this work and it had not been carried very far when he fell twenty years later.

The Church had not the excessive power Mr Cheke supposes, though it enjoyed a certain independence which Pombal abolished; he made it as far as possible a department of state with himself as supreme head. In a country so profoundly religious this policy was bound to be reversed. He treated the Inquisition in much the same way. His quarrel with the Jesuits was a political one, but it involved the ruin of their civilizing work in the colonies. Though he was a regalist, he was not a free-thinker and the works of the Encyclopædists were not allowed to circulate.

Mr Cheke gives only one side of John V. The King's mistresses had no political importance and he was a hard-working ruler; when his dignity was involved, he could flout even the Holy See. For forty years he kept his

country at peace and, while Pombal neglected both the army and navy, Portugal under John came out of the War of the Spanish Succession with her European territory intact and secured gains in South America. Furthermore John V was a great patron of the arts, and the buildings, furniture, silver work and printing of his time are famous

The book has a bibliography but no references for its quotations

EDGAR PRESTAGE.

LYME REGIS.

Linguistische Studien II. By G. VAN LANGENHOVE. (*Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, Werken uitgegeven door de Faculteit van de Wijsbegeerte en Letteren*, 87e Aflevering). Antwerp 1939. xvii + 151 pp

In his first volume of *Linguistische Studien*, reviewed in *MLR* xxxiii (1938), pp. 306-9, Professor van Langenhove raised many interesting questions on the relationships between the Germanic languages and drew attention to the predominantly religious and juridical character of the early Germanic vocabulary. The final proof of his theories was reserved for a subsequent volume. Contrary to expectations this second collection of four essays, written in French, does not take up the threads of the earlier work, but the author now embarks on speculations on various primitive Indo-European roots.

The first essay deals with the root **ǵheu-* to which Professor van Langenhove attaches the significance 'vital force' and which he sees, modified by various determinants, in Engl. *water*, O.E. *wǣr*, Latin *unda*, O.E. *wōs*, Latin *ūrīna*, etc. This same root is also the subject of the second essay in which the etymology of Gothic *brūþs* and *frauja* is considered.

In the third essay another root **ǵher-* is examined. This appears in bird-names (e.g. O.H.G. *aro*) and with the determinant **k-*, which is supposed to have the meaning 'living being', in other names of birds (e.g. Engl. *crow*). These names are all connected with early religion and it is not surprising that the same root should also appear in various gods' names, e.g. O.N. *Hrungnir*, the name (in Old Norse mythology) of Thor's opponent.

The final essay, *Notes pour une théorie de la racine*, gives the principles of Professor van Langenhove's theories on roots and root-determinants on which his etymologies are based.

At first sight there would seem to be little connexion between these various topics, but there is nevertheless an underlying unifying theme. Professor van Langenhove hopes eventually to demonstrate the morphological unity of the religious vocabulary of the early Indo-European languages. When the final proof of his interesting theories will be forthcoming we cannot tell, since as in the first volume some of the crucial points are deferred and will be more fully examined in *Linguistische Studien III*! Germanists will perhaps regret that after the promising beginnings of *Linguistische Studien I*, Professor van Langenhove appears to have abandoned at least temporarily the narrower field of Germanic

philology for more hazardous speculations, and may be inclined to answer in the affirmative the author's query, 'Mais s'imposer pareille tâche, n'est-ce pas s'engager dans le domaine de la spéculation, n'est-ce pas vouloir sonder l'inconnaissable?'

CHARLES T. CARR.

ST ANDREWS.

Historische deutsche Grammatik, Vol. I. *Geschichtliche Einleitung/Lautlehre*. By CARL KARSTIEN. (*Germanische Bibliothek*, 1. Abt., 1. Reihe, Bd. 20.) Heidelberg: Winter. 1939. xlv + 200 pp. M. 9.

'And then there is Karstien's *Historische deutsche Grammatik*', will, I think, be the phrase with which one will draw the student's attention to this work; it is intended as a student's handbook. The main weaknesses of the work are briefly the following: it has been cast and recast, but never finally trimmed; 'Die Forschung der letzten zehn Jahre... konnte nur sehr gelegentlich in einer nachträglichen Anmerkung oder einem kurzen eingeschobenen Nebensatz Berücksichtigung finden' (xiii); the writer is a 'Linguist' and, one gathers, therefore not competent to review critically recent writings on the origins of Standard German (xv)—full reports on even patently suspect theories relating to problems of Primitive Germanic (e.g. Guntert on the causes of the sound shifts) evidently compensate for this. The work is, in short, not really focused on the subject in hand.

The *Geschichtliche Einleitung* (pp. 1-41) has good points, and I think one might recommend it to students. Professor Karstien's views on 'Ingwaonisch' and West Germanic, which have been made known to us perhaps mainly through a contribution of his pupil, Helmut Arntz, to the Behaghel *Festschrift* of 1934, are here clearly formulated. 'Ingwäonisch' is, now that Wrede's theories have been refuted, a convenient label for Anglo-Frisian idiom and for Anglo-Frisian characteristics in other Germanic dialects (p. 13).

Das Anglo-Fries. (Ingwaon.) steht dem Deutschen als selbständiges Gebilde gegenüber, ja dieses mag von Haus aus sogar dem Gotischen näher gestanden haben als dem Ingwaonischen. Die mannigfachen, aber relativ späten Neuerungen des Ingwaonischen und Deutschen (die sog. wg. Konsonantendehnung ..) die zum Begriff des Westgerm. geführt haben, sind erst das Ergebnis der Umlagerungen bes. der späteren deutschen Stämme. . . nur in diesem Sinne, im Sinne einer auf geographischer Basis sekundär erwachsenen Verkehrsgemeinschaft besteht der sprachliche Begriff des Westgermanischen zu Recht (p. 19).

The rest of the volume is taken up by the Phonology, in which the development of Idg. and PG. vowels and consonants down to the Modern German *Schriftsprache*¹ is traced direct (i.e. the customary subdivisions, from Idg. to Germanic, from Germanic to West Germanic, etc., are omitted); the aim is to emphasize the continuity of change; the method has the disadvantage that the development from Primitive Germanic to

¹ Whether it was a good idea of the author to lengthen the definition of *Schriftsprache* by the phrase 'und der Gebildete... das gesprochene Wort anzupassen bestrebt ist' (p. 29) is, incidentally, open to question.

Modern German seems an endless series of vertical descents—there are no restful horizontal sections. There are better phonologies.

F. P. PICKERING.

MANCHESTER.

Vrastmunt. Ein Beitrag zur mittelhochdeutschen Wortgeschichte. By ERIK Rooth. (*Lunder Germanistische Forschungen*, 9) Lund. C. W. K. Gleerup 1939. 87 pp. Kr. 3.50.

Professor Rooth, general editor of the *Lunder Germanistische Forschungen*, makes in the work under review his first personal contribution to this series, taking as the basis for his investigations Jakob Grimm's short article *Frast* (D.Wb. iv, 1. 1, 64). MHG *vrast* occurs only once and appears to have the same meaning as the compound form *vrastmunt*, namely, according to Lexer, 'Kuhnheit, Mut', or more nearly perhaps, 'Zuversicht, Freimutigkeit'. The latter occurs three times, and adverbially three times with the forms *vrastmundi*, *vrastmuntlichen* and *vrastgemunde* respectively. Two other forms *frastmütich* (adj.) and *frastmütlichen* (adv)—from an Early MHG. (Milstätter) psalter, edited by Nils Tornqvist, Lund 1934—would seem to belong here also, derived from an unrecorded alternative *vrastmuot*. Rooth also conjectures the use of *vrastmunt* in the twelfth-century Bavarian version of the MHG. *Lucidarius*, where later extant MSS. derived from this read either *frist* or *franzmüt*. The form *fransmuot* ('Glück') and its variants, including Early NHG. (Swiss) *franschmuot*, etc. ('Kühnheit, Keckheit'), is shown—at very great length (pp. 25–42, i.e. a full quarter of the actual text)—not to be directly connected with *vrastmunt* although Grimm and others had been led to think so. The late fifteenth-century *fraschmunt* (adj.) and *fraschmundigkeit* ('Redsamkeit'), on the other hand, appear to be direct descendants of *vrastmunt*. The disproportionate length of this section is due, in part, to an eight-page discussion of the varied fortunes of *franspuot* ('Glück'): it might perhaps have been more advisable to have carried out this, in itself interesting, investigation as a separate article or appendix, to be but briefly referred to in the main argument.

OHG. *frastmunti*, 'secretum', and *vrasmunt* (*Mainzer Friedgebot vom Jahre 1300*), 'eigenes, heimliches Gemach', present some difficulty, but Rooth nevertheless endeavours, not altogether convincingly it is true, to identify these with the word treated. Though his investigations are primarily of a semantic nature, Rooth has, naturally, touched also upon questions of orthography and phonology. Strangely enough, however, he has not found it necessary to mention the absence of *t* in twelfth-century *mit stäten vrasmunde* (*Himmel u. Hölle*) and in *in sinem vrasmunde* (*Mainzer Friedgebot*). Such an occurrence is, of course, not unknown (cf. *masboum* side by side with *mastboum*—Paul, *Mhd. Gramm.*¹², § 75, Anm. 1), but the fact that it appears here in two isolated cases, unconnected either in point of date or dialect, seems deserving of mention, in particular as it would, in the latter case, have provided an opportunity for stressing Rooth's objection to Lexer's reading of the form in the *Mainzer Friedgebot* as *vrasmunt*—'Schutz vor *vreise*'—a word not otherwise found.

Following Grimm, Rooth brings *vrastmunt* etymologically into line with Gothic *frasts* ('Kind') and suggests that the Germanic etymon of *vrast-* must have had the meaning 'Kraft, Gedeihen'; *-munt* is shown to be Icur. **mnti-* 'Sinn'. The sparing use of *vrastmunt* (almost without exception in Bavarian and Austrian MSS.) would suggest that its component parts had early become etymologically obscure.

As supplement (pp. 71-86) Rooth prints the *Mainzer Friedgebot* from the original MS., the only other printed copy, from the year 1789, being unreliable. Some notes on the language of the MS. and a photographic plate, showing the passage in which *vrasmunde* appears, are appended. It is a pity that the two-page description of the MS. and its history does not also come here instead of in the midst of the discussion on *vrastmunt*. But though there may be some minor criticism as regards the arrangement of this work and perhaps some disagreement as to the findings, the care and scholarship with which the various points discussed are investigated deserve full praise and recognition.

C. BAIER.

BIRMINGHAM.

Hartmann von Aue: Erec. Edited by ALBERT LEITZMANN. (*Altdeutsche Textbibliothek* xxxix.) Halle: Niemeyer. 1939. xxxvi+262 pp. M. 6.

There could be no more welcome addition to the *Altdeutsche Textbibliothek* than this excellent production of the text of Hartmann's *Erec*, carried out as it is by a tried veteran so eminent as Leitzmann. Its value is undiminished by the publication of Naumann's edition of *Erec* some years back. The present edition, dedicated though it is to the memory of Moritz Haupt, shows, in contrast to Naumann's, complete independence of Haupt's too long trusted authority, and starts again from bedrock. For the proof and vindication of this independence one must turn to Leitzmann's sound and masterly study of the Ambras Manuscript (*PBB.* 59, 143-234), an indispensable prelude, beyond which there is little room left for a reviewer's comments. The investigations reveal, in the first place, numerous errors in transcription committed by Haupt's amanuensis, accepted with incredibly facile good faith by Haupt himself, and only now rectified. From this clearance of long-standing misconceptions and errors Leitzmann proceeds to a careful scrutiny of the MS. itself and of Johann Ried's scribal or linguistic characteristics, dealing with these in detail under two headings: *Graphische und grammatische Eigenheiten* (200-213) and *Eigenheiten des Wortgebrauchs* (213-233). By this means, and with constant reference to authentic readings supplied by earlier MSS., more particularly of *Gregorius* and *Iwein*, a satisfactory basis is found for the establishment of a text which, if it leaves many doubtful points unsolved, at any rate marks an advance on previous editions. Special appreciation will be felt for the new punctuation (an improvement to which Leitzmann himself draws no attention), and especially for the clear and logical differentiation of full stop, colon

and comma, as compared with the earlier predilection for a frequently misused colon.

One's chief regret is that size and format prevent a complete registration of MS. readings; in this respect the article in the *Beitrage* is more circumstantial, and one must turn to it for more exact information. Certain points, however, have entirely escaped comment, e.g. the smoothing of ll. 4023-4 by the deletion of 'er' in the first line as compared with Haupt's rendering and as compared further with the defective MS. reading recorded by Haupt. But this is a small point. A more striking omission occurs in connexion with l. 1658, where no mention is made of the MS. reading (recorded by Haupt) *Ither Gahernes*. The accepted emendation *Ither von Gaherne* is incorporated in the text without comment. Certainly not a point to be passed over in silence.

The introduction, necessarily short, leaves one vital thing in abeyance. If, as Leitzmann believes, 1190 was the date of the Crusade in which Hartmann took part, what then was the probable date of *Erec*? No attempt is made to hazard a reply to that question.

MARGARET F. RICHEY.

LONDON.

Nicolaas Jarichides Wieringa, een zeventiende-eeuws vertaler van Boccacini, Rabelais, Barclay, Leti e.a., bevattende ook een onderzoek naar de vermaardheid dier schrijvers in Nederland. By C. L. THIJSSSEN-SCHOUTE. (*Teksten en Studiën op het gebied van taal, stijl en letterkunde, Deel II.*) Assen: Van Gorcum. 1939. 494 pp. 3.90 Fl.

This study, as its title indicates, is a full and accurate account of all the existing Dutch translations and imitations, as well as of all the editions in the original language of Boccacini, Rabelais, Barclay, Leti and a few others, which appeared in Holland (mostly at Elzevier's) in the seventeenth century. The subject is treated from the points of view of syntactical analysis, diction and bibliography. The chapters on Boccacini and his translators Hooft and Wieringa are the most important. They contain a minute comparative analysis of these authors' sentence structure, their use of the gerund, the present participle and the infinitive, based on a very extensive material. The method used is that of Professor G. S. Overdiep in his *Zeventiende-eeuwsche Syntaxis* and other works on Dutch syntax: a grammatical analysis made in order to arrive at an objective characterization of the style of a period. It is inherent in the method that an author's marshalling of his facts, his relative stressing of these and his rhythm should receive more attention than the pictorial qualities of his work, but the chapter on diction enabled Mevr. Thijssen to make valuable observations on the latter. Wieringa's style appears to be in many respects similar to that of the Elizabethan translators. In his sentence-structure and diction he shows himself a clever yet unobtrusive purist, whereas Hooft, in trying to imitate Italian syntax to some extent, sometimes indulges in constructions which run counter to the genius of

the language and are hard to unravel. Hooft's purism in diction is of the etymological variety.

The chapter on Wieringa's *Rabelais* is concerned only with diction and metaphorical character. Sainéan's *La Langue de Rabelais* was a reliable guide here. Mevr. Thijssen shows that Wieringa, by drawing largely upon his native Frisian, proved equal to the task of naturalizing the Rabelaisian idiom, which is the more creditable since, unlike Urquhart, he had no Cotgrave to refer to. Wieringa's renderings of Barclai, Leti and Santa Croce are treated more summarily, as being not nearly so well done. The chief importance of the last-mentioned work lies in the fact that it contains ten added letters by the translator, in which he discusses contemporary politics in the manner of Boccacini's *Ragguagli di Parnaso*.

The bibliographical sections appear to be well-informed and accurate. In the chapters on syntax the author shows an intimate knowledge of the problems of Romance grammar and of the literature on the subject in French, German and Italian. The many illustrative passages in the text render the argument somewhat difficult to follow, but this has been obviated as much as possible by means of headings *in margine*. An eighteen-page summary in French is appended, and a supplement containing lengthy passages from all the works discussed enables the reader to acquaint himself with these books, hitherto available only in rare seventeenth-century editions.

TH. WEEVERS.

LONDON.

The Life and Philosophy of Johann Gottfried Herder. By F. McEACHRAN. (*Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature.*) Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1939. 98 pp. 7s. 6d.

It is something of a feat to have condensed into 87 pages even a brief account of the writings of an author whose works occupy 32 volumes in Suphan's edition; and of an author moreover by no means easy to have or to hold, a phenomenon or a portent rather than a critic and philosopher. Herder's incalculable effect on his contemporaries and posterity is among the major problems which beset the path of the student of German literature. He is forever challenging us to face him; we are forever turning a blind eye. For what with the extent, the range, the formlessness, breathlessness and general indigestibility of Herder's writings, he seems to be doomed in this country at least never to enjoy anything more solid than lip-service and *succès d'estime*. And yet his formative influence on German letters during the whole of the nineteenth century, and indeed up to the present day would be hard to exaggerate.

Mr McEachran, whose sketch of Herder's life is too meagre to justify its inclusion in the title of his monograph, has applied himself doggedly to the philosophical works, and has produced a clear if not very enlivening summary of Herder's leading philosophical ideas. It is a painstaking, intelligent and meritorious study backed by an impressive (if

badly-arranged) bibliography; and those many among us who like to take our Herder in small doses or at second-hand ought to be grateful for his labours. I rather doubt, however, whether this book will make its hero's literary personality any more vivid or less baffling than heretofore. If anything in fact it becomes more confusing owing to the conscientious effort to link Herder up with Spinoza, Leibniz, Descartes, Plotinus *i tutti quanti*. And as for the famous *Humanitätsideal*, it has dwindled almost to nothing by the time the book is read:

What he called *Humanität* and what he appealed to so often as the goal of his desire was really hardly more than the expansion of this original idea [the conception of *Wirkung* or influence] and one which never really got very far beyond the initial stage. Although an attempt has been made, not altogether without success, to find an objective reality in his mind, it must be confessed that the nearest approximation is his conception of the *Gefühlsmensch*, which in its turn is a reaction against the *Vernunftmensch* of Cartesian days.

One cannot but feel that the author of these words was justified from his point of view in compressing Herder so firmly into so small a space. To tackle such a vast mass of material only to arrive at such a negative conclusion with regard to Herder's most important philosophical conception must have been a disillusioning experience, and one which he was evidently reluctant to make his readers undergo with him for any length of time.

E. M. BUTLER.

MANCHESTER.

Oberon: Translated from the German of Wieland by John Quincy Adams.
 Edited with an Introduction and Notes by A. B. FAUST. New York:
 F. S. Crofts. 1940. 340 pp. \$3.

This book is at least a curiosity of literature. In 1798 an American ambassador—later the sixth President of the United States—arrives in Berlin and learns German by translating certain works. His progress, painfully slow in the first stages, quickens when he turns from historical prose to make a verse translation of *Oberon*. Wieland fascinates him. It is the attraction of contraries: both poet and translator have had a Puritan upbringing, and John Quincy Adams has remained, as he always will remain, a stalwart among the uprighteous, while Wieland has sloughed his first rough skin and endeared himself to the Graces—and the Follies. It takes Adams from November, 1799, to May, 1800 to complete his first version, and another year to polish off two complete revisions, on all of which Professor Faust reports with scholarly detail. There is no question of fatal facility—the brow-bent care of the translator is obvious; but the speed is ominous, certainly if we remember that Fairfax needed five years for his *Jerusalem Delivered* and Mickle three years for the *Lusiads*. Adams's translation, a happy discovery of Professor Faust, is here published for the first time; for the translator suppressed his work when he discovered the existence in print of Sotheby's translation (1798) and heard the verdict of Wieland, to whom a copy of the new translation had been submitted, that the prior translation was better as poetry while the

new one was more faithful. With Wieland's verdict Professor Faust does not wholly agree; and, in the case of one purple patch at least, he even claims (p. 332) that his countryman 'matches the original in metrical skill and poetical power'. All depends, of course, on the ideal of translation: shall the translator's aim be Goethe's concise direction: *schöner!* or the plodding pupil's need of creeping closeness in the key he uses? Even as a key Adams fails occasionally, as Dr Faust dutifully points out; and he might have added a few dubious renderings such as: 'Until the knight himself were in a state/In person his account to give to Charlemagne' (= *Bis Huon selbst instande war/Dem Kaiser in Person die Rechnung abzulegen*, lines 3671-2), and ambiguities ('Oh hadst thou seen that Angel-form, like me!' = *O hattest du den holden Engel doch/Gesehn wie ich!* lines 1601-2). It is of more importance that finesses are missed; particularly where Wieland has tongue in cheek ('his little Christian wisdom' = *sein bisschen Christentum*, l. 2963). But it is when we compare Adams with Sotheby, from whose translation Dr Faust prints useful extracts, that we wheel round to Wieland's considered judgment. Adams's verse is eminently readable: the verse has the graceful gliding of good taste and (though in less degree than Sotheby's vigorous numbers) the hall-mark of traditional heroic verse. But Adams never has the leap of ecstatic poetry. A close analysis might show that Sotheby attains his metrical effects by manipulating the rhythm (i.e. mostly by *Taktwechsel*), whereas Adams keeps to the steady grind of his iambic measure. Sotheby uses alliteration: he has 'Whether they speed along unwonted ways,/Wing'd through the pathless regions of the air' for Adams's 'whether through the air/Or in the common paths their journey move.' Dr Faust seems to regard such ornate diction as tinsel, and there is much to be said for simplicity; but the real test is the personal throb—if we apply a mammalian term Sotheby has a perilous high pressure while the pulse of Adams's verse is congenitally languid. *Oberon* is admittedly a terrible task for the translator, if only because the rhythm varies deliberately as the moods change from rapid narrative to highly coloured description and passionate poetry, but there will be no standard translation of this, the last and gayest of the romantic epics, till a sufficiently equipped translator rises to the high emprise. Adams's translation could not be the standard, if only because he standardizes—his ideal, as the revisions show, would have been to regularize line-lengths and have a uniform rhyme-scheme, *ababcedd*; which means that he did not realize the consummate artistry with which Wieland fitted length of line to sense and mood or the rhymecraft which (Rilke-like) poises even *und* at the line's end (l. 7226). Moreover a fit translator would drive at the very inspiration of the poem—Wieland's insistent theme that frailty is necessary and delightful. Nor would he allow himself Adams's grotesque inversions (e.g. 'Himself comes not to pluck them out to try'). If appreciation of the translation must be guarded, every Germanist must be grateful to Professor Faust for the gift of his treasure trove and for his pious but not uncritical editing. His metrical insight is perhaps sometimes a little dubious: e.g. when pointing out (p. 319) that Adams emended a line from

'Thus speaking, up to them he spurs his steed' to 'Thus speaking, to them he spurs up his steed' he assumes a copying error, 'as the emended line does not read metrically', whereas Adams surely intended to stress *to*. And there is a reference (p. xl) to the 'first stanza of Klopstock's *Messias*'. ..

J. BITHELL.

PENZANCE.

SHORT NOTICES

Miss Hannah Buchan has edited *The Poems of Thomas Pestell* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1939. 146 pp. 12s. 6d.) with as much scholarly care as though he were among the great. Thomas Pestell (1585-1667) is an almost forgotten minor poet of those fertile years. So nearly forgotten is he that the *Cambridge History of English Literature* knows nothing of him; his name does not appear in the *Oxford Book of Seventeenth Century Verse*, and even that indefatigable recoverer of minor Caroline poets, Professor Saintsbury, ignores him. Mr H. W. Massingham and Mr Norman Ault alone among modern anthologists have preserved samples of his work. Now his life has been reconstructed by Miss Buchan, his poems annotated, the records of his trials at law reprinted.

Miss Buchan makes small claims for the subject of her labours. 'He had little sensibility.' She admits 'In his verse there is much that is tasteless and pedestrian and even merely silly. But the bulk is workaday stuff with the interest of the work-a-day, interspersed with "strong" lines, one or two pleasant pieces and a few interesting contemporary references.' The standard of the work-a-day was high in the seventeenth century. Pestell writes 'vers d'occasion', elegies, epistles and epigrams, under the influence of John Donne (whom he several times mentions with admiration). It is Donne's satires and epistles that inspire him, not the *Songs and Sonnets* and seldom the Devotional poems. Pestell writes no poetry, but his verse is sometimes witty, often vigorous; and, though it does not rise above mediocrity, it seldom falls below it.

The most interesting section of the book is, however, Appendix B which contains the Records of two law-suits against Thomas Pestell. In 1633 he defends himself against charges of 'beating his neighbours', 'sollomnizing dyvers Clandestine marriages without any banes asked or lawfull licence from a competent Judge first obtayned;' and giving communion to one who was excommunicate and refusing it to one who was not. In 1646 he faces other judges, prejudiced against the one time Chaplain in Ordinary to Charles I. Some of the old charges are revived and new ones are added, such as keeping 'beagles and hounds to hunt withal' and speaking against the Parliament. Miss Buchan prints the whole of his spirited defence. Thomas Pestell was not much of a poet, but he was a 'character'; we owe a debt to Miss Buchan for resuscitating him, albeit with a lurking doubt whether he quite deserved her careful labours.

JOAN BENNETT.

CAMBRIDGE.

Bertrand H. Bronson's *Joseph Ritson. Scholar-at-Arms* (Berkeley: University of California Press, Cambridge: University Press. 1938. 2 vols. xxii+820 pp. 34s.) is a natural sequel to some shorter articles by the same writer. It is a full, well-documented study which would, in the main, satisfy the exacting standards of its subject, who might, however, be expected to growl at certain details, e.g. the casual explanation, in a footnote on p. 212, of the different usage of two kinds of brackets in the text, the equally casual footnotes about Ritson's letters, manuscript collections and holograph transcripts, on pp. 223 and 225, and the absence of a general bibliography. Ritson would nevertheless approve of *A Ritson Bibliography*, and he would not quarrel with the minuteness of the study. Mr Bronson's method is to deal first with Ritson's life and then with his great controversies—with Warton, with the Shakespearian editors of whom he disapproved, with Percy, whose irritated feelings regrettably found some assuagement in the circumstances of Ritson's death—and finally to give an account of his activities as Bailiff of the Savoy. The last contains much hitherto unpublished material, but the earlier parts of the two volumes show equally well Mr Bronson's conscientiousness and his power of marshalling his evidence. Ritson, the first of the great English critical editors, the effects of whose teaching are, in Mr Bronson's words, 'to be felt in every piece of scholarly editing, of recent years, in the field of English literature', even though much of his work is 'a pleasure to scholars and a pain to the general reader', deserved as careful and minute a study as this, and has been fortunate in receiving it from a scholar whose recognition of his difficult nature and illiberal handling of controversies does not prevent him from admiring Ritson's scholarship and agreeing with Surtees and Sir Walter on his character.

E. C. BATHO.

LONDON.

William D. Templeman's *The Life and Work of William Gilpin (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. xxiv, Nos. 3-4, University of Illinois Press. 1939. 336 pp. \$3.00)* has developed out of a doctoral thesis presented at Harvard some years ago, and bears some marks of its beginnings in its careful accumulation of data, not always of great importance, but it is at the same time a work of humane studies. The sub-title, *Master of the Picturesque and Vicar of Boldre* brings out the double interest of Gilpin's personality. Students of aesthetic theory will find profit in chapters VI, VII and X, which ought logically to have followed immediately on chapter VII; here Mr Templeman deals with the use of the word 'picturesque', with Gilpin's own development of the word and of the search for 'the picturesque', and with his influence, not merely in this country but on the continent, where his *Essay on Prints* in particular was translated and enlarged and had an extraordinary seminal power. Of equal historic interest, perhaps as humanity goes of greater importance, is the other side of Gilpin's character: the enlightened schoolmaster, evidently a born teacher with original ideas on organization, the vicar

whose strength was in pastoral care, who devoted the profits of books and drawings to the building and endowment of the schools at Boldre, who founded an insurance society for his women parishioners, and whose indignation at the state of the poorhouse led to the establishment of one which was a model of practical and humane arrangement. There was no slackness in the parish of Boldre, whatever there may have been elsewhere, between 1777 and 1804, and it may be suspected that Mr Templeman, beginning with an aesthetic study, found himself in the end willingly involved in a study of character.

E. C. BATHO.

LONDON.

Galt's *Gathering of the West, or We're Come to See the King*, is a characteristic and lively piece, and the edition of it by Mr Bradford Allen Booth (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1939. 109 pp. 7s.) is welcome. The text is reprinted from the first edition, and the introduction gives a competent survey of the history of Scotch vernacular fiction and of Galt's place in it, as well as a study of this particular piece. Most of this is excellent, but Mr Booth tends to exaggerate his points. It is, for instance, hardly fair to say that the success of *The Annals of the Parish* and *The Entail* 'is due wholly to the artless rusticity of Galt's Ayrshire speech' (p. 8). Galt is anything but artless. His skilful use of dialect is essential for the successful portrayal of the people with whom Galt deals in his Scotch novels, but his understanding of them, his sense of humour and his powers of characterization are equally necessary, and indeed these qualities in Galt's work are stressed elsewhere in the introduction. Moreover, Mr Booth quotes Galt's own description of *The Gathering in the West* as 'a mere occasional *jeu d'esprit*', but fails to note how immediately it followed its occasion: *Blackwood's Magazine* for September 1822, in which it first appeared, was of the nature of a 'souvenir number' dealing almost entirely with the King's visit to Edinburgh in the middle of August. It is intended as an 'eye-witness account', and Mr Booth's comparison with Scott's novels in this respect (pp. 33-4) is beside the point. The book is well produced and printed, though a few obvious misprints have been left.

WINIFRED HUSBANDS.

LONDON.

Professor J. Vendryes, the distinguished French Celticist and comparative philologist, on whose shoulders the mantle of Meillet has chiefly fallen, gives in these pages (*La Position Linguistique du Celtique*, the Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture for 1937. *Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. xxiii; London: Humphrey Milford. 41 pp. 2s.) a valuable brief account of the problems of how the Celtic tongues stand in relation to their linguistic neighbours. He emphasizes the difficulties of working out any satisfactory scheme of relationship between allied languages, and the dangers of trying to identify linguistic data like the alternation *q: p*

in the Celtic languages with archaeological and ethnographic facts. This warning is nowadays as much needed as ever, when such great advances are being made in knowledge of the welter of cultures of the Central European Bronze and Iron Ages. He analyses the elements of phonetic, vocabulary, and morphology shared by Celtic with the Germanic and Italic branches of Indo-European; and comes to the conclusion that even if the old belief in a single antecedent solid Italo-Celtic unity is a wrong point of view, there is good ground for allowing that the two groups had at an early stage a considerable and special closeness to each other, and that this community was something more intimate than the relationship of Celtic to Germanic, which is remarkable chiefly in vocabulary.

This is an interesting and well-conceived exposé of the linguistic philosophy of the French school of philologists, and one that commands the greatest respect; though it is perhaps hardly the most important of the growing list of British Academy *Rhys Lectures*. A single criticism: how can we really know that 'les Indo-Européens se sont répandus sur le monde avant tout par la conquête' (p. 8)?

KENNETH JACKSON.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

A source of unnecessary difficulty in the study of the French *chanson populaire* is the want of standard authorities or titles. Doncieux' *Romancéro* covered a very narrow range of ballads exhaustively; Rolland's work embraced almost all the important songs, but with embarrassing lapses in authority and completeness. The two collectors, supplemented perhaps by Puymaigre and Gérold, might have helped Miss Irène Thérèse Whitfield to show clearly the relation between her interesting Louisiana ballads and those of the mother-land (*Louisiana French Folk-Songs*, Louisiana State University Press, 1939. xiv + 159 pp. \$3), and to mitigate the perplexity due to the anarchy of titles. What Miss Whitfield calls *Mon père avait cinq cents moutons* is more generally known as *La brebis sauvée au loup*, and is imperfectly described either way. The real theme is how a shepherdess tricked a gentleman. Easy identification is the more desirable since Miss Whitfield's collection contains versions of *Les métamorphoses*, *La brebis sauvée*, *Le Petit mari*, *Joli tambour*, *La courte paille*, *La Belle Hélène ou la danseuse noyée*, *Malbrough*, *Le retour du mari soldat*, and probably *La porcheronne*. Textually it does not appear that the new versions add to what we know from the old. There are some identical tunes, notably *Malbrough*. The tune for *Les métamorphoses* is that of Rolland 191d, with a change of rhythm. The contours have diverged owing to the introduction of new intervals, and yet a number of notes are held in common. The Louisiana tune for *Joli tambour* is not quite like any I have noted. For *La courte paille* a simple two-clause ditty is employed, simpler than those reported for France and Provence. A waltz from *Calcasieu parish* is said to be in the debt of an English ballad tune (unspecified), and if so is an interesting sign of the contact of English and French balladry on American soil.

The songs of Louisiana are either in French or Cajun or Creole. The Cajun dialect is that of the Acadian settlers, and for these pieces the reader has reason to thank Miss Whitfield for her phonetic transcriptions. The music also is, so to speak, dialectal, and is marked by impure tones, some quarter-tone intervals (but not, apparently, third-tones as in the Balkans), the portamento style of singing, irregular pulse and irregular stanzas. They include some memories of French folk-songs, but in this respect they are rather disappointing. The themes are mostly new. One constantly meets the rejected suitor who threatens to ride off to Texas (the wild west of Louisiana thought) with a bottle for companion. The songs styled 'Creole' are those of the negroes who learned French from their masters. They preserve none of the traditional subjects, and they display many intrusive English words.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

German grammarians have drawn attention to the fact that *hin*, which originally meant 'from here', i.e. 'away from the speaker', later acquired the significance 'away', as in the sentence 'Wo gehen Sie hin?' The stress is no longer on the starting point, but on the destination. In modern usage the secondary meaning is the commonest. It is the merit of Walther Theodore Eickmann's New York doctoral thesis, now available in abridged form (*The Semasiological Development of the Pronominal Adverbs of Motion in Old High German*. New York University Graduate School. 1939. 18 pp.), to prove that this new development was present in Old High German, and incidentally to vindicate the value of Otfrid as an exponent of vernacular syntax. Charges of undue classical influence on this writer are thus refuted. The work under review presents a tabulated list of Old High German adverbs of motion (*thara, wara, thanan, wanana* etc.) with their frequency of occurrence, and their different shades of meaning. Anglo-Saxon forms are given for purposes of comparison. Apart from the points already mentioned, we learn that *thana* with certain verbs often has the sense 'away', and that on one occasion Notker uses *hinan* in the causal meaning, 'hence'. These are somewhat meagre results for such a laborious task.

We miss a reference to *erhina* in the *Hildebrandslied*, but probably the author regarded the text as unreliable in this case. A little more care should have been devoted to proof reading. There is a misprint on p. 14 'primative' for 'primitive', and what is more serious, in the bibliography the *Oxford Dictionary* appears under the heading 'Otfrid', and *Tatian* under the rubric 'Sulpicius Severus'. Kluge's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* should not be consulted in the 1934 edition, since several other editions have appeared since that date.

JAMES M. CLARK.

GLASGOW.

With the appearance of Part II, English-German (London: Cassell. 1939. 687 pp. 7s. 6d.), *Cassell's German Dictionary*, by Karl Breul,

revised and enlarged by J. Heron Lepper and Rudolf Kottenhahn, is now complete, and the whole work is available in one volume for 12s. 6d. Part I (17 + 813 pp. 6s.) appeared in 1936, and was reviewed in *M.L.R.* xxxi (1936), 617. Thus thirty years after the publication of the first edition in 1909, between which date and 1934 it was reprinted, with revisions, sixteen times, there appears now the last revision in which Professor Breul himself will have taken a part.

What was said in 1936 of the German-English part—that it is much more than a mere reprint—is equally true of the English-German section. In mere bulk alone there is a large increase, for not only has the number of pages risen from 545 to 687, but a reduction of the margin has made a considerable addition to the printed area of each page. An examination of the separate articles will reveal that it is not a simple question of additions, including pronunciation of the English key-words in the transcription of the International Phonetic Association, but that the whole has been submitted to a most careful scrutiny, and has benefited by all kinds of subtle improvements. As an instance of the inclusion of quite topical terms may be quoted the German equivalent of 'black-out'.

The original Cassell's German Dictionary, compiled by Miss E. Weir, was, according to Professor Breul in his first preface, published in 1888, and had 'for many years been held in well-deserved esteem'. Now after more than half a century it enters on a new lease of life, and whatever other dictionaries they may possess it is hardly likely that serious students of German will wish to be without the latest 'Breul'.

H. G. ATKINS.

LONDON.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

January—March 1940

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON (English)

GENERAL

- Atti del secondo Convegno nazionale di studi sul Rinascimento; con una bibliografia Medicea a cura del Dott. Camerani. Florence, Vallecchi.
- BALDWIN, C. S., *Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice. Classicism in the Rhetoric and Poetic of Italy, France and England, 1400–1600*, ed. by D. L. Clark, Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 17s. 6d.
- Enciclopedia Universale illustrata, xiii. Milan, Vallardi. L. 100.
- HORVÁTH, E., *Il Rinascimento in Ungheria*. Rome, Cremonese.
- International Bibliography of Historical Sciences, 1937. Paris, Coln. 300 fr.
- ROSS, N., *Heroic Poetry from the Book of the Dean of Lismore*. Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd. 16s.
- THIBAUDET, A., *Réflexions sur la littérature*. Paris, NRF. 65 fr.
- TROYAT, H., *Dostoievsky*. Paris, Fayard. 28 fr.
- Year's Work in Modern Language Studies, The, ed. by L. W. Tancock and A. Gillies, x. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Medieval Latin.

- ETHER, Q. P., *Le 'De Trinitate' de Richard de Saint Victor* (Coll. ét. méd. d'Ottawa). Paris, Vrin. 20 fr.

Italian.

- ALFIERI, V., *Tragedie*, i. Milan, Sonzogno. L. 4.
- ALFIERI, V., *Vita*, ed. G. Dolci. Milan, Hoepli. L. 12.50.
- Almanacco letterario Bompiani, 1940. Florence, Bompiani. L. 12.
- ARDU, G., *Francesco Crispi*. Milan, Ceschina. L. 25.
- BERNARD, T., *Théâtre*, vii. Paris, Calmann-Lévy. 20 fr.
- BITELLI, G., *Giuseppe Parini*. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- Canti popolari siciliani, ed. V. De Simone. Milan, Ed. Latine. L. 10.
- CAVOUR, *Discorsi parlamentari*. Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 44.
- CHIAPPA, V., *Umanità di D'Annunzio*. Rome, Nuove Grafiche. L. 12.
- COCCHIARA, G., *Problemi di poesia popolare*. Palermo, Palumbo. L. 15.
- DE' MEDICI, C., *Lettere*, ed. G. Spini. Florence, Vallecchi.
- DE' MEDICI, G., *Poesie*, ed. G. Fatini. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 30.
- DE SANCTIS, F., *Storia della letteratura italiana*, ed. G. Lazzeri, i. Milan, Hoepli. L. 125.
- FERRARA, M., *Machiavelli, Nietzsche e Mussolini*. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 8.
- FOSCOLO, U., *Poesie*, ed. G. Natali. Bologna, Cappelli. L. 8.50.
- GALILEI, G., *Antologia*, ed. G. Baggin. Padua, Cedam. L. 10.
- GALILEI, G., *Frammentario e lettere*, ed. G. Gentile. Florence, Sansoni. L. 13.
- GHISI, F., *Feste musicali della Firenze Medicea*. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 90.

- GINORI CONTI, P., Vita ed opere di Pietro di Dante Alighieri. Florence, Fond. Ginori Conti. L. 80.
- GOLDONI, G., Commedie. Milan, Mondadori. L. 40.
- MACHIAVELLI, N., Clizia, ed. E. Allodoli e R. Melani. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 5.
- MONTANARI F., Francesco De Sanctis. Brescia, Morcelliana. L. 10.
- OLOBARDI, U., Saggi su Tozzi e Pea. Pisa, Vallerini. L. 12.
- PALAZZI, F., Novissimo Dizionario della lingua italiana. Milan, Ceschina. L. 55.
- PIRONALLI, A., Antonio Fogazzaro. Catania, Studio Editoriale Moderno. L. 7.
- PREZZOLINI, G., Repertorio bibliografico della storia e della critica della letteratura italiana dal 1902 al 1932, 2 vols. L. 450.
- PROFETA, O., Da De Roberto a Pirandello. Catania, Studio Editoriale Moderno. L. 7.
- PULCI, L., Il Morgante Maggiore. Milan, Sonzogno. L. 4.
- REGGIO, G., Gabriele D' Annunzio (Vocilontane e prossime). L. 15.
- SILENZI, R. E. F., Pasquino. Florence, Bompiani. L. 40.
- TRUCCHI, E., Esposizione della Divina Commedia. 3 vols. Milan, Trucchi. L. 60.
- VERDE, R., Studio sulle Rime del Petrarca. Catania, Etna. L. 18.

Spanish, Catalan, Basque.

- BREUIL, H., et H. OBERMAIER, Altamira à Santillana (Espagne). Paris, Éd. Universitaires. 1500 fr.
- BUCICH, A. J., Estéban Echeverría y su tiempo. Buenos Aires.
- CROCE, A., La 'Dorotea' di Lope de Vega. Studio critico e traduzione. Bari, Laterza. L. 25.
- LARRASQUET, J., Action de l'accent dans l'évolution des consonnes étudiée dans le Basque Souletin. Paris, Maisonneuve. 60 fr.
- LARRASQUET, J., Le Basque Souletin nord-oriental, i: Introduction. Paris, Maisonneuve. 50 fr.
- LARRASQUET, J., Phonétique du Basque de Larraja. Paris, Maisonneuve. 15 fr.
- MENDOZA, V. T., Romance y corrido. Univ. Nac. de México.
- MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, R., La España del Cid. 2nd ed. revised. Madrid, Calpi.
- ROURKE, T., Simón Bolívar. London, Joseph. 15s.
- Vitoria et Suárez: contribution des théologiens au droit international moderne. Paris. Pedone. 80 fr.

Portuguese.

- CASTRO, Pe JOSÉ DE, Portugal em Roma, 2 vols. Lisbon.
- COUTINHO, B. X. C., Bibliographie franco-portugaise. Porto.
- FERREIRA, J., História da Literatura portuguesa. Porto.
- FIGUEIREDO, A. LEITÃO DE, Herculano e Dollinger. Coimbra.
- LEITÃO, J., A mulher na obra de Gil Vicente. Lisbon.
- NOGUEIRA, R. DESÁ, Elementos para um Tratado de Fonética portuguesa. Lisbon.
- SILVA, A. VIEIRA DA, A Cêrca moura de Lisboa. Lisbon, CML.
- VASCONCELOS, J. LEITE DE, Opúsculos, v, vii. Lisbon, Imprensa Nacional.
- VELOSO, QUEIROZ, Fernão de Magalhães: sa vie et son voyage. Paris.
- VIANA, M. G., Afonso de Albuquerque. Porto.
- VICENTE, GIL, Quem tem farelos? Lisbon, Seara Nova.
- VIEIRA, A., Antologia de Sermões, ed. M. Gonçalves Viana. Porto.

French.*(a) General (including Linguistic).*

LETRAZ, J. DE, Manuel franco-anglo allemand. (Military lexicon.) Paris, Berger-Levrault. 12 fr.

Studies in French Language and Medieval Literature presented to Professor Mildred Pope by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends. Manchester, Univ. Press. 25s.

(b) Modern French.

ALAIN, Préliminaires à l'esthétique, 101 propos (1907-36). Paris, NRF. 27 fr.

AUBREE, É., Balzac à Fougères (Les Chouans) Paris, Perrin. 25 fr

BENRUBI, J., L'Idéal moral chez Rousseau, Mme de Staël et Amiel. Paris, PUF. 60 fr.

BEZARD, Y., Le Président de Brosses et ses amis de Genève Paris, Boivin. 50 fr.

CARCO, F., Bohème d'artiste. Paris, Michel. 18 fr.

CHEVALIER, ALICE, Claude-Carloman de Ruthière, premier historien de la Pologne. Paris, Domat-Montchristien. 60 fr.

CHEVALIER, ALICE, Ruthière, Jean-Jacques Rousseau et la Comédie de Caractère. Paris, Domat-Montchristien. 25 fr.

DIMIER, L., Racine perdu et retrouvé. Paris, Corrêa. 21 fr.

DOYON, La Canne de Jules Laforgue et la statue de Bobillot. Paris, La Connaissance. 50 fr.

FRANCON, M., Notes sur l'esthétique de la femme au XVI^e siècle. Paris, Nizet et Bastard. 60 fr.

GARAUDY, R., Les Orateurs de la Révolution Française. Paris, Larousse. 2 fr. 50.

GUILLEMEN, H., Lamartine. Paris, Boivin. 15 fr.

LE CORBEILLER, A., Les Diaboliques de Barbey d'Aurevilly. Paris, Malfère. 18 fr.

LEROY, M., La Pensée de Sainte-Beuve. Paris, NRF. 55 fr.

MACCHIA, G., Baudelaire critico. Florence, Sansoni. L. 18.

MAISTRE, J. DE, Une politique expérimentale, textes choisis par B. de Vaulx. Paris, Fayard. 25 fr.

MATTEI, A., L'Homme de Descartes. Paris, Aubier. 22 fr.

PRIESTLEY, H. I., France overseas through the Old Régime. London-New York, Appleton-Century. 25s.

RAYMOND, M., De Baudelaire au Surréalisme, nouv. éd. augmentée. Paris, Corti. 50 fr.

SAINT-RENÉ TAILLANDIER, MME, Racine. Paris, Grasset. 40 fr.

SOUCHON, P., Olympio et Juliette. Paris, Michel. 20 fr.

THARAUD, J., Discours de réception à l'Académie française. Paris, Plon. 15 fr.

VALENCE, ODETTE, et S. PIERRE-LOTTI-VAUD, La Famille de Pierre Loti. Paris, Calmann-Lévy. 22 fr.

VIANEY, J., La Psychologie de La Fontaine. Paris, Malfère. 18 fr.

WHITFIELD, I. T., Louisiana French Folk Songs. Louisiana State Univ. Press. \$3.00.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

English.*(a) General (including Linguistic).*

ALEXANDER, S., Philosophical and Literary Pieces. London, Macmillan. 15s.

Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place Names, The, compiled and ed. by E. Ekwall. 2nd ed. Oxford, Univ. Press. 15s.

- DU BOS, C., *What is Literature?* London, Sheed and Ward. 5s.
 KELLY, B. M., *The Sudden Rose. An Essay on the Unity of Art.* London, Sheed and Ward. 6s.
 MACDERMOTT, M. M., *Vowel Sounds in Poetry Their Music and Tone-Colour.* London, Kegan Paul. 5s.
 O'NEILL, F. R., *The Social Value of Art.* London, Kegan Paul 6s.
 Oxford Companion to English Literature, The, compiled and ed. by Sir P. Harvey. 2nd ed. Oxford, Univ. Press. 15s.
 University of Texas Studies in English, 1939. Austin, Univ. of Texas. \$1.00.
 WHITTEN, W., and F. WHITAKER, *Good and Bad English.* London, Newnes. 6s.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

- COLGRAVE, B., *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert.* Cambridge, Univ. Press. 21s.
 COULTON, G. G., *Studies in Medieval Thought.* London, Nelson. 2s. 6d.
 Durham Cathedral Manuscripts. To the End of the Twelfth Century. Introduction by R. A. B. Mynors. Printed for the Dean and Chapter at the Oxford Univ. Press £5. 5s. to subscribers.
 Hali Meïðhad, ed. from MS. Bodley 34 A and MS. Cotton Titus D xviii by A. F. Colborn. Copenhagen, Munksgaard; London, Oxford Univ. Press. Kr. 8.
 KERN, F., *Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages.* Oxford, Blackwell. 12s. 6d.
 KIRBY, T. A., *Chaucer's 'Troilus'. A Study in Courtly Love.* University, La., Louisiana State Univ. Press. \$3.00.
 RIESS, L., *The History of English Electoral Law in the Middle Ages.* Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
 WAGNER, A. R., *Heralds and Heraldry in the Middle Ages.* Oxford, Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.
 Warwickshire Feet of Fines, The, Abstracted from the originals in the Public Record Office by E. Stokes and L. Drucker. Vol. II, 13 Edw. I (1284)—18 Edw. III (1345). (For the Dugdale Society.) London, Oxford Univ. Press. 35s.

(c) *Modern English.*

- BARTLETT, H. C., and A. W. POLLARD, *A census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto, 1594-1709, revised and extended by H. C. Bartlett.* Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 56s. 6d.
 BOAS, F. S., *Christopher Marlowe.* Oxford, Clarendon Press. 15s.
 BRYANT, D. C., *Edmund Burke and His Literary Friends.* St Louis, Washington Univ. \$2.75.
 CHARLTON, H. B., *Romeo and Juliet as an Experimental Tragedy (Proceedings of the British Academy).* London, Oxford Univ. Press. 2s. 6d.
 DAICHES, D., *The Novel and the Modern World.* Chicago and Cambridge Univ. Presses. 15s.
 DOUGLAS, Lord ALFRED, *Oscar Wilde. A Summing-Up.* London, Duckworth. 6s.
 ELLIS-FERMOR, U. M., *The Irish Dramatic Movement.* London, Methuen. 10s. 6d.
 ELTON, O., *Essays and Addresses.* London, Edward Arnold. 7s. 6d.
 EVANS, B. I., *Tradition and Romanticism. Studies in English Poetry from Chaucer to W. B. Yeats.* London, Methuen. 6s.
 HEROIC Poetry from the Book of the Dean of Lismore, ed. by N. Ross. London, Oliver and Boyd (for the Scottish Gaelic Texts Society). 16s.
 Irish Theatre, The, ed. by L. Robinson. London, Macmillan. 7s. 6d.
 JENSEN, G. E., *The Life and Letters of Henry Cuyler Bunner.* Durham, N.C., Duke Univ. Press. \$3.00.

- LONG, O. W., Frederic Henry Hedge: A cosmopolitan Scholar. Portland, Maine, Southworth-Anthoensen Press.
- LUCAS, F. L., Ten Victorian Poets. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- MANTELL, G., The Journal of, ed. by E. C. Curwen. Oxford, Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.
- MC EUEEN, K. A., Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben. Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Torch Press.
- NETHERCOT, A. H., The Road to Tryermaine. A Study of the History, Background, and Purposes of Coleridge's 'Christabel'. Chicago and Cambridge Univ. Presses. 18s.
- PESTELL, T., The Poems of, ed. with an Account of his Life and Work by H. Buchan. Oxford, Blackwell. 12s. 6d.
- SHANKS, E., Rudyard Kipling. London, Macmillan. 7s. 6d.
- SPENCER, H., The Art and Life of William Shakespeare. New York, Harcourt Brace. \$2.25
- TEMPLE, The Rev. W., The Genius of English Poetry (The English Association). London, H. Milford.
- TOBIN, J. E., Eighteenth Century English Literature: A Bibliography. New York, Fordham Univ. Press. \$2.00.
- Tudor Translations, chosen by His Honour Judge Clements. Oxford, Blackwell. 12s. 6d.
- WILLIAMS, R. R., Religion and the English Vernacular. A Historical Study concentrating on the years 1526-53. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.
- YEATS, W. B., Last Poems and Plays. London, Macmillan. 6s.
- YOUNG, G. M., The Age of Tennyson (Warton Lecture on English Poetry). London, Oxford Univ. Press. 1s. 6d.

TIME, PLACE, AND POLITICS IN 'KING LEAR'

DOVER IS, I believe, the only place mentioned in *King Lear* as connected with the action.¹ It is natural to suppose that Gloucester's castle is near Gloucester,² but there is no confirmation in the play. Cornwall's is within a few hours' ride of Gloucester's, and although Albany's is still less definitely located, the impression left is that the distance is much the same. Since Albany takes the place of Cambria in the old play of *King Lear*, he may have been thought of as living somewhere in the West like the others. The text itself, however, gives us no clue whereby to place any of them. Nor is there any hint as to the situation of the royal palace where the opening scene presumably takes place. It may have become the residence of one of the king's daughters. If so, it must be identified with Cornwall's, for Lear certainly left it to go to Albany's (I, 1, 287-8). It was certainly within a day's journey of Gloucester's castle, where the second scene appears to be laid. But in this Gloucester's words, 'And the king gone to-night' (24) do not, to say the least, hint at any change of locality, so that it would appear possible, either that Lear was holding his court at Gloucester's, or else that Gloucester, after the division of the kingdom, remained in possession or at least in charge of the royal palace.³

The distance of any of these places from Dover, the only fixed point, is left quite vague. We get the impression that it cannot be very great and that messengers pass readily from one centre to the other; but that is all. The most definite indication is that, as the text now stands, Oswald goes from Cornwall's to the neighbourhood of Dover while Lear is wandering distracted about the fields, although a 'century' (whatever that may be)

¹ Unless, as Capell suggested, 'Gloucester' in I, v, 1 means the town and not the earl. But I think there can be no doubt that in this passage 'Gloucester' is a mistake for 'Cornwall'. (My references are to the lines of the Globe edition (1891), but not always to its text, which (like all modern editions) relies far too much on the Quarto. This, I am convinced, contains a (presumably shorthand) report obtained from performance.)

² Not *in* the town, or even very near it, since 'for many miles about There's scarce a bush' (II, iv, 304). Indeed, there is really no more reason why Gloucester should live near Gloucester than that Albany should live in Scotland.

³ There is, indeed, some evidence that this was the case, for at II, ii, 1 Oswald, on his arrival at Gloucester's, asks Caius-Kent 'art of this house?' to which the latter answers 'Ay'. Kent was certainly not in Gloucester's service, but he was in Lear's, and he might quite properly regard himself as of the household in any formerly royal residence at which the king was about to arrive. If this is so, it must have been one of the smaller residences, perhaps a hunting box: 'This house is little' (II, iv, 291). On the other hand, Gloucester speaks of it as 'mine own house' (III, iii, 4).

is scouring the country for him. I think that all this vagueness is intentional and designed to prevent topographical difficulties impeding the rapidity of the action.

The opening scene (I, 1), in which Lear divides up his kingdom, naturally takes place at court, wherever that may happen to be. Royal business was usually transacted in the morning, and the whole affair would probably be over before dinner. Thus there would be ample time for the king to leave the same evening in order to take up his residence with Goneril: 'I think our father will hence to-night.—That's most certain' (287). It can be no great distance, since he would hardly propose riding far into the night.

I, ii, with Edmund's plot, follows. There is no indication where the action takes place, but its sequel, Edgar's flight (II, i), is certainly at Gloucester's castle, and the locality must be the same in both.¹ Edmund promises to place Gloucester where he may overhear the truth of Edgar's intentions, 'and that without further delay than this very evening' (100). This promise is fulfilled in the pretended quarrel and surprise in II, i, 16–87, which in fact happen after dark ('Lights, ho, here!...Torches, torches!' 33), and the two scenes must therefore be on the same day.² Gloucester's first words: 'Kent banished thus! and France in choler

¹ If we could separate I, ii from II, i, the former would be most naturally placed still at court on the evening of Lear's departure, but this seems to me impossible. See the next note

² There must be no mistake about this, for it is the crucial point in the ostensible time-scheme. Those who try to reconcile the conflicting time indications of the play have to suppose that, so far from Edmund's trap being sprung the same evening, Edgar remains hidden in his brother's 'lodging' for a fortnight! Others assume that we have to do with two distinct and unrelated plots, of one of which we watch the laying but not the outcome, and of the other the outcome but not the laying. If I understand them aright (of which I am not quite sure), this is the contention both of A. C. Bradley and of Granville-Barker. The former, in his classical work on *Shakespearean Tragedy* (1904, p. 245), speaks of 'Edmund's idea (not carried out) of making his father witness, without over-hearing, his conversation with Edgar', the latter, in his penetrating and invaluable *Prefaces to Shakespeare* (I, 1927, p. 149, note), writes, 'Yet another slight change of plan may be guessed at; it would effect some economy in the working out of the sub-plot. Edmund says to Gloucester about Edgar: "If your honour judge it meet, I will place you where you shall hear us confer of this... and that without any further delay than this very evening." But he never does.' But surely this would be an incredible piece of clumsiness on the part of an experienced dramatist. Naturally the events in II, i do not exactly follow the lines proposed in I, ii. Edmund offered to place his father where he should overhear his conversation with Edgar. Obviously he could not do this without giving himself away; he must also at all costs prevent Edgar being apprehended. He never, of course, intended to fulfil his promise literally. What he does is to make Gloucester think that he is trying to fulfil it. He posts his father in his hiding place ('My father watches', II, i, 22), after the latter has 'set a guard' (18) to take Edgar (should his suspicions be confirmed); he then goes to call Edgar from his lodging, and forces the pretended quarrel out of ordinary ear-shot ('I hear my father coming', 30, is only said to frighten Edgar), thus driving his brother to flight before he could be seized. These are masterly tactics. And we are asked to believe that this has nothing to do with the earlier scene; that after the crucial plot had been laid for 'this very evening', Shakespeare without a word of explanation simply dropped the matter, and arranged for a quite different catastrophe a fortnight later!

parted! And the king gone to-night!' (I, ii, 24), seem at first sight to imply that it is the same day as in I, i: but in that case it would be already night, which, though consistent with Edmund's promise ('this very evening'), would make II, i practically continuous with I, ii and leave no time for the intervening events of I, iii-v, which moreover cannot possibly take place the same day as I, i. We must, therefore, suppose that Edmund's plot is contrived the morning after Lear subscribed his power, and that by 'to-night' Gloucester means 'this past night', for which there is ample warrant in Shakespearian usage¹

I, iii-v are at Albany's and are closely connected. Lear must have arrived the night before and has gone out hunting. It is now dinner time, that is early in the afternoon. Goneril (iii) instructs her steward Oswald to foster discontent in Lear and his followers in pursuance of the plan hinted at in her talk with Regan (I, i, 307-10), and goes to write letters to her sister warning her to follow a like course.

Next (iv), Lear returns from the hunt, calling for dinner; he meets Kent in his disguise as Caius (the name he assumes is only known from v, iii, 283) and takes him into his service. The insolence and humiliation of Oswald follow, and then the quarrel with Goneril. Lear announces his intention of removing forthwith to Regan's, and bids call his train together (274). Discovering that half his knights have been dismissed, he threatens to take back his delegated authority: 'Thou shalt find That I'll resume the shape which thou dost think I have cast off for ever' (330); and in a rage goes to take horse. Goneril calls Oswald, who has been inditing her letter to Regan, and dispatches him with it, bidding him return with all speed. The news it contains has been rather mysteriously brought up to date and includes not only complaints against her father's knights (355, and cf. II, i, 103), but all 'What he hath uttered' (353); it even announces her intention to visit her sister (II, iv, 186).

In the last short scene (v) of the act we see Lear's actual departure. While waiting for his horses he too has found time to write to Regan warning her of his immediate arrival, and with this news he bids Kent hasten ahead, or he will be there before him. Kent replies: 'I will not sleep, my lord, till I have delivered your letter' (5), implying that the journey will anyhow take him well into the night. A gentleman then announces that the horses are ready, and Lear at once sets out followed

¹ C. T. Onions, in his *Shakespeare Glossary*, cites *Merchant of Venice*, II, v, 18: 'I did dream of money-bags to-night', and various other instances.

only by his immediate attendants.¹ There is a difficulty in the first line of this scene: 'Go you before to Gloucester with these letters. Acquaint our daughter ...'. Here 'Gloucester' must be an error for 'Cornwall'. However it may have arisen, the mistake was easy enough, since it was in fact at Gloucester's that Lear eventually met Regan.²

In the interval between acts I and II, as we subsequently learn, Kent reaches Cornwall's, with Oswald hard at his heels, on receipt of the several letters the duke and duchess decide to be 'from home', and hastily prepare to visit Gloucester (II, IV, 27-35). It is already dark. 'The night before there was no purpose in them of this remove' (II, IV, 3). They take horse with their meime, bearing the two messengers from Albany's with them. Another messenger, Curan, is sent on ahead to warn Gloucester of their coming (II, I, 2), and no doubt one of Oswald's fellows (he had come with 'some company', I, IV, 359, but was himself still 'Stewed in his haste', II, IV, 31) back to Goneril to report their movements.

In II, I we are back at Gloucester's. The night must be far advanced, for Curan has already delivered his message, and is now having a few confidential words with Edmund. No doubt his unexpected news has delayed the promised revelation of Edgar's supposed treachery: this now takes place (Edmund making clever use of Curan's report of discord between the dukes) and is followed by Edgar's flight and Gloucester's anger and despair. Upon the heat of this Cornwall and Regan arrive. The scene is either in, or more likely just outside, the castle. Edgar has been concealed in Edmund's 'lodging' (I, II, 184), whence his brother calls him to 'descend' (II, I, 21). The phrase may suggest a house adjoining the castle and, since Edgar appears to have no difficulty in making his escape

¹ It is clear that his knights do not accompany him. There are several allusions to these, and they are, I think, really quite consistent. It is true that when, on Lear's arrival at Gloucester's, Kent asks: 'How chance it that the king comes with so small a number?' (II, IV, 64), the Fool affects to see in it an allusion to the dismissal of fifty of the knights; but it may equally well refer to the absence of the remainder (Kent had not actually witnessed Lear's departure, I, V, 7). It is also true that at the end of the same scene (307) Regan says: 'Shut up your doors. He is attended with a desperate train;' but this may refer to their expected arrival quite as well as to their presence; while the imminent danger in which Gloucester supposes Lear to stand at III, VI, 95-104 is unintelligible if the king had his knights at hand. The conclusive passage, however, is Oswald's report that

Some five or six and thirty of his knights,
Hot questrists after him, met him at gate (III, VII, 16-17).

From this it is clear that the knights have been pursuing the king all the way from Albany's (*via* Cornwall's, of course) and have at last most opportunely caught up with him as he is leaving Gloucester's. He is now safe under their protection during the journey to Dover.

² Capell suggested that Cornwall and Regan were residing in the town of Gloucester, which would make their remove to Gloucester's neighbouring castle easy. But this cannot have been the case, for they 'travelled all the night'—or so at least they said (II, IV, 90). Granville-Barker was before me with this emendation: 'I give a guess that "Gloucester" in this line is a slip for "Cornwall"' (p. 229).

in the middle of the night, it would seem probable that he was not actually within the castle walls.

II, II is certainly before the castle. The time may be an hour or two later: it is still dark ('though it be night, yet the moon shines', 34) but nearing day ('Good dawning to thee, friend', 1). Oswald, who has apparently lagged behind, meets Caius-Kent who has arrived earlier, but he does not recognize him.¹ Kent is naturally surprised, and asks him, 'Is it two days since I tripped up thy heels, and beat thee before the king?' (II, II, 31). Presumably 'two days since' may by a stretch mean 'yesterday'. There follows the quarrel, and Kent is put in the stocks. Apparently it is by this time day: Kent bids Gloucester 'good morrow' (165), and though the sun may not yet have risen, it is light enough for him to read Cordelia's letter (172).² But he is 'All weary and o'er-watched' (177), and soon falls asleep.

The Folio makes one scene only of what are in modern editions II, II-IV, but to this conflation there are two objections which seem to justify the change. One is the improbability of the fugitive Edgar returning to the castle, even at daybreak, until he has assumed a disguise: the other is that it makes one continuous scene run from early dawn to nightfall.³

After Edgar has gone to assume his disguise of Tom o' Bedlam (III), Lear enters with a few followers (IV) and finds Kent in the stocks. He had set out from Albany's the previous afternoon, and has, of course, ridden round by Cornwall's (1-4): the company has either journeyed comparatively slowly (in spite of Lear's 'if your diligence be not speedy, I shall be there afore you', I, V, 4) or perhaps bailed (at Cornwall's?) on the way,

¹ It would be tempting to suppose that he had been sent back from Cornwall's to report to Goneril (especially as in I, IV, 363 the latter had urged his swift return), and that he now arrives to announce that she too is on her way. However, he delivers no message (and at II, IV, 186 Regan expects her sister on the ground of her 'letter' not of a message) and the time is probably too short to allow of a double journey. Moreover, Regan has just informed us that 'the several messengers From hence attend dispatch' (II, I, 126). There can be no question of a day intervening between II, I and II, for Kent has only recently arrived: 'I have watched and travelled hard' (II, II, 162).

² I do not feel very certain of this. What Kent says is (170).

Approach thou beacon to this under globe,
That by thy comfortable beams I may
Peruse this letter.

Perhaps he falls asleep before there is light enough to read by. (This was Malone's view.) What follows is too obscure, and possibly corrupt, to afford any ground of argument.

³ Some editors have committed the absurdity of making II, III a separate scene and then marking the locality as 'The Same', i.e. before Gloucester's castle! There is no scenic difficulty in the Folio's arrangement—Edgar can perfectly well speak his lines on the front of the stage while Kent slumbers in the background—the impropriety is dramatic. I believe *Lear* to have been written for performance on a perfectly plain stage without the usual alcove and curtain at the back. If so, once Kent had been put in the stocks these necessarily remained in view of the audience until his release, and no change of scene was possible. Hence the irrational conflation of the Folio.

for the day is already well advanced and three hundred lines later it is night. The quarrel with Regan and Cornwall follows, and then Goneril arrives. She comes apparently straight from home, having no doubt had notice of her sister's movements. She has with her a trumpet, but no other attendants are mentioned: a large train would be unsuitable to the 'little house' (291). Just before she arrives Oswald enters, evidently to announce her coming: presumably he has been sent out, or has gone out, to meet her. The quarrel is resumed, and in the end Lear dashes off into the storm, rejecting and rejected by his second daughter. He is accompanied by Kent, the Fool, and a Gentleman, and Gloucester follows. The latter returns to announce: 'He calls to horse, but will I know not whither' (300). 'Alack, the night comes on', he adds; while Cornwall's final words (311):

Shut up your doors, my lord; 'tis a wild night:
My Regan counsels well: come out o' th' storm

show that night has fallen and that they are still outside the castle.

Act III follows without a break. Lear has not taken horse, but has wandered off on foot with his Fool and Gentleman. Kent, who started with him, appears to have lost him again and returned to the castle 'demanding after' him, where he has been refused entrance (III, ii, 65). The Gentleman too has got separated from him, though he had evidently followed for a while (i, 4-17). Kent and the Gentleman now meet accidentally, and the former, without revealing his identity, imparts the contents of Cordelia's letter, namely that she is at Dover, and persuades his hearer to seek her out and inform her of what has happened. Their more pressing business, however, is to find the king.¹

III, ii is continuous with the preceding. Lear is wandering about with the Fool in the open country near the castle ('for many miles about There's scarce a bush', II, iv, 304). Kent at last finds them and leads them towards a hovel he knows of.

III, iii is back again at the castle, now inside. Gloucester discloses to Edmund his knowledge of the designs of France ('I have received a letter this night...there is part of a power already footed'², 10, 13) and his

¹ The scene was heavily cut on the stage: lines 22-9 are not in the Quarto; 30-42 (as well as 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ -15 $\frac{1}{2}$) are not in the Folio. Moreover, the transition from 29 to 30 is harsh and obscure, and I have no doubt that at this point something was cut out of both texts and is consequently lost. Granville-Barker agrees, speaking (p. 226) of 'the cutting of a common original (of which still more may have existed...)'.

² This might mean no more than 'afoot'. The Quarto, however, reads 'landed', and although the Quarto is of no authority, its interpretation in this case is shown to be correct by Cornwall's words at the beginning of III, vii: 'shew him this letter; the army of France is landed'. The sense is, moreover, confirmed by III, vii, 45, 'the traitors Late footed in the kingdom'.

not altogether disinterested intention to 'incline to the king' (14), he adds: 'If I die for it, as no less is threatened me, the king my old master must be relieved' (18).

In III, iv Lear, Kent, and the Fool have reached the hovel, from which Poor-Tom-Edgar emerges. Meanwhile, Gloucester, in pursuance of his resolve, has come out in search of the king, and offers to bring them 'where both fire and food is ready' (159).

III, v is again in the castle. Edmund having betrayed his father to Cornwall, the secret letters have been discovered, which incidentally reveal the urgency of the political situation. Edmund is ordered to apprehend Gloucester immediately.

In III, vi the wanderers enter the promised shelter. Where this is we do not know,¹ but it has furniture of a sort and a curtained recess with a couch, so that it must be a room of some sort and not a mere shed. Gloucester goes out at once to collect what comforts he can. During his stealthy search he overhears a plot against the king's life (95), though nothing apparently of his own danger, and has a horse-drawn litter made ready, wherein Lear may 'drive toward Dover' (98). He returns to find that the king's mind has given way, and that he is now asleep on the couch. They bear him out in their arms, Edgar alone remaining behind. Later we learn (III, vii, 16) that:

Some five or six and thirty of his knights,
Hot questrists after him, met him at gate,
Who, with some other of the lords dependents,
Are gone with him toward Dover, where they boast
To have well-armed friends.

III, vii must again be continuous, for Cornwall is not the man to suffer delay either in the arrest of Gloucester or in preparations to meet the danger of invasion: 'the army of France is landed' (2). He at once sends Goneril and Edmund to carry the news to Albany. They are accompanied by Oswald, who posts on ahead and reaches home before them (iv, i, 2). Gloucester is now brought in, and there follows the horrible scene of the blinding, together with the scuffle with the servant in which Cornwall receives his death-wound. It may or may not be already daylight. The scene is inside the castle, for there is a chair handy to which Gloucester can be bound (34), and he is afterwards thrust 'out at gates' (93). Some servants (in the Quarto only) propose to 'get the

¹ Editors have been curiously specific; several follow Theobald in supposing 'A Chamber in a Farm-house'! It may be some back premises of the castle itself (Granville-Barker, with fine perception, speaks of 'the outhouse, all of his own castle that Gloucester dare offer', p. 177), or some neighbouring building—possibly Edmund's lodging, since Gloucester has taken him into his confidence—possibly even the home of the 'tenant' of iv, i. Perhaps it was this last possibility that Theobald had in mind.

Bedlam To lead him where he would' (103): Edgar had evidently shown himself about the previous afternoon.

Act iv begins soon after. No doubt it is now daylight. Gloucester enters, led by an old man, his tenant. They meet Edgar somewhere in the neighbourhood of the castle, and Gloucester sends the old man back to bring clothing for 'the naked fellow' (1, 42, 46), whom he hires (80) to lead him to the cliffs of Dover.

In iv, ii we have the arrival, presumably in the course of the day, of Goneril and Edmund at Albany's. Goneril's 'Welcome, my lord' (1), is not of course a greeting, but an invitation to enter her house. Oswald, who had arrived before them, reports Albany's strange behaviour: 'I told him you were coming; His answer was "The worse!"' (5). At this Goneril, foreseeing trouble with her 'mild' husband, sends Edmund straight back to Cornwall¹ out of harm's way—with a kiss. She has barely time to start quarrelling before news comes of Gloucester's blinding and Cornwall's death. Albany asks what has happened to Edmund, and is told that he was 'Come with my lady hither' (90), but that the messenger had 'met him back again', that is, on his way back (as Wright observes).

With iv, iii (only preserved in the Quarto) the scene shifts to Dover, where it remains generally centred to the end of the play. Henceforth the time indications are less definite, though the sense of speed hardly relaxes. I do not propose to follow the subject further.² What I have tried to demonstrate is the closely-knit time scheme up to this point, and the rapid, almost breathless, pace of the action which it involves. There can be no doubt, I think, that this is intentional,³ and that Shakespeare

¹ 'Hasten his musters and conduct his powers' (16)—which seems to show a prophetic knowledge of the duke's accident!

² There is one difficulty in the time-scheme of the last two acts. It is very tempting to invert the order of iv, iv and v (Eccles in 1792 placed iv, v before iv, iii; but this is quite unnecessary.) There are two objections to the received order. First, at iv, 21 'The British powers' are already marching towards Dover, while in v Regan is still at home ('Our troops set forth to-morrow', 16) and Edmund has wandered off vaguely 'to descry The strength o' th' enemy' (13). (By the way, most editors are surely wrong in following Capell, who lays this scene at Gloucester's castle. Regan must have returned to her own palace to muster her troops. Capell, of course, believed that Cornwall lived in Gloucester: hence perhaps the mistake.) Secondly, since the distracted Lear is already wandering about the fields in iv, iv ('he was met even now', 1), he has to continue doing so throughout Oswald's journey from Cornwall's to Dover in search of Edmund (announced in v), before they can both reappear in the course of vi—an arrangement by which, it is contended, the 'century' must be hunting for the king throughout at least one night. To the first of these objections it may be replied that though Regan has not yet set out in v, Albany's powers are already on the march (v, 1), and it may be the latter that are reported nearing Dover in iv; and to the second that we really have no idea how long it would take Oswald to reach the neighbourhood of Dover, or, alternatively, that there is no reason why Lear should not continue his wanderings during the night.

³ 'Shakespeare', says Granville-Barker (p. 170), 'is hunting Lear and the play's action hard and using every device to do it.'

deliberately hurries his audience along at whatever cost to probability.¹

This cost, however, was undoubtedly a heavy one, for the schedule I have extracted from the time-indications that link the several scenes proves, on further examination, manifestly impossible, and is indeed flatly contradicted by several definite statements in the text. We have seen that the time of I, iii-v must be the day following I, i. But in the very first line of I, in Goneril asks: 'Did my father strike my gentleman for chiding of his fool?' while from I, iv, 77 we learn that Lear had not seen his Fool 'this two days'. He had, therefore, been at least two days at Albany's, while other indications—such as 'the fool has much pined away' (iv, 80), the charge that Lear's 'knights grow riotous' (iii, 6), and suggestions of 'a great abatement of kindness' (iv, 64) and 'a most faint neglect of late' (iv, 73)—imply a longer though vaguer interval. Much more serious is the dismissal of the king's knights: 'What, fifty of my followers at a clap! Within a fortnight!' (iv, 316). How Lear came not to notice or be informed of this earlier is an unsolved mystery, but he certainly discovers it as soon as he seeks to collect his followers for his departure, and the only natural explanation of the phrase 'Within a fortnight' is 'During the fortnight that I have been here'.² Even a fortnight allows scant time for the landing of the French army, which is apparently an accomplished fact by the time Lear leaves Albany's,³ but it is no doubt sufficiently long and sufficiently vague to prevent spectators worrying over the problems of mobilization.

Thus we become aware of a double stream of time flowing. In the foreground we have the time scheme determined by the actual duration of the various episodes directly represented and by the links between them: beyond is the wider and more leisurely flow of events which we know must have happened, but whose duration, because they are not immediately presented to us, it is possible at least in some measure to ignore. It is an old dramatic device: as old as Aeschylus and the *Agamemnon*. As every dramatist knows, it works well enough on the stage, always

¹ The action so far appears to occupy four days: (1) Lear's abdication (he may spend part of the night travelling to Albany's); (2) his quarrel with Goneril (he rides through the night to Gloucester's); (3) his quarrel with Regan (he spends the night on the heath); (4) his flight to (and arrival at?) Dover. The rest of the action could, I fancy, be compressed into two more days, but there is no proof that it is as hurried as that.

² It has been suggested (by Eccles) that Lear's words mean 'What, fifty of my followers under orders to leave within a fortnight!' but I am quite sure that no spectator would so understand them. If there were no other indication of a lengthy interval, the explanation might possibly be allowed to pass, but in view of the evidence generally it must be rejected.

³ See below, p. 442.

supposing that the contradictions are not too glaring and are prevented from forcing themselves on the attention of the audience.¹

That, of course, is the essential condition for the success of what is sometimes called dramatic time, and I wish to examine its bearing on the problem of the French invasion. This has not, I think, received the attention it deserves. In the old play of *King Leir*, where the aged monarch is restored to his throne and all ends happily, sympathy is of course wholly on the side of the invaders, and the author does not appear to be conscious of raising any political issue. To Shakespeare, whose dramatic reputation had been built on a long series of patriotic 'histories', such political naivety or detachment was impossible. It is true that, since he converted the play into a tragedy, it was no longer necessary for the foreign invader to be victorious, but it remained a ticklish business, since sympathy was still asked for Cordelia and the French power and was indeed implicit in the plot. However remote this patriotic dilemma may seem to us, to an Elizabethan audience, with its lack of historical perspective, it was real enough. Shakespeare evidently felt it, and did his best to hold the balance even. The really sympathetic characters Kent and Edgar² take no part in the conflict on either side, while in command of the British party is placed the not unsympathetic Albany, who is torn between patriotism and conscience. His divided motives, as well no doubt as the divided sympathies of the author, express (or fail to express) themselves in the very obscure speech (doubtless corrupt: it is in the Quarto only) put into his mouth before the battle (v, i, 23):

Where I could not be honest
I never yet was valiant: for this business,
It touches us, as France invades our land,
Not bolds the king, with others whom I fear
Most just and heavy causes make oppose.

At the same time the very treatment of the plot that was forced upon the dramatist by his art tended in some ways to increase his political diffi-

¹ Of course, attempts have been made either to work out a plausible time scheme for *King Lear*, or to reduce its time-data to order. Eccles, who published an edition in 1792, tackled the difficulty after the manner of the eighteenth-century 'improvers' of Shakespeare, by moving i, ii to a position immediately before ii, i and coolly excising the opening words of Gloucester's speech (22-5) that link it with i, i. More recently A. P. Daniel produced a less drastic but less logical solution by allowing Edgar to remain concealed in Edmund's lodging for a fortnight. But these are obviously factitious remedies. The contradiction is in the play itself: the only thing to do is to recognize it, and with it the double time.

² There is some contradiction in regard to Edgar. He leaves Gloucester in v, ii with the words: 'If ever I return to you again, I'll bring you comfort', which suggests that he is about to enter the battle. Yet he apparently does nothing of the sort. But this short scene is admittedly unsatisfactory, and it looks as though a speech from an earlier draft may have been left standing. Whatever the explanation of Shakespeare's treatment at this point, it is clear that he did not wish to centre interest on the battle.

culties. The author of the old play, if he was conscious of these at all, sought to lessen them in two ways. In the first place, he made the husbands of the elder daughters independent sovereigns, the kings of Cornwall and Cambria (in this departing from Holinshed); so that, though the scene of the battle was in Britain, it was in fact fought between three foreign powers. In the second place, he made Leir appeal directly to Gallia for aid, so that it was as the old king's acknowledged champion that the latter set foot in the kingdom. But this Shakespeare's Lear could never do. for him it was as impossible to appeal to France as to go cringing back to Goneril (II, iv, 216), and even after he had been removed to Dover he refused so much as to see the daughter he had wronged (IV, iii, 42). Thus it is solely on his own, and Cordelia's, responsibility that France brings his army over.

Now let us see what bearing the time scheme has upon this problem, for unless I am mistaken it is of considerable importance. We are not really concerned with the time allowed for the levying and transport of the army, whether it be a day or a fortnight. As I have already pointed out, it is only the *text* that limits us to a night and a day, and this the *spectator* is in no position to check. When he hears of the 'fortnight' he does not yet know that Edgar's flight is going to close the time-bracket opened by Edmund's plot; and by the time he knows of the flight, still more by the time he hears of the invasion, he will have forgotten—and Shakespeare had very likely forgotten—how closely Gloucester's words in I, ii link the occasion of the plot with that of the abdication. Moreover, the fortnight itself is vague, and even on that imagination will not insist. There is then no difficulty about allowing what time we will for the preparation of the French invasion—provided always that *the preparations began as soon as the king left the British court*.

But this at once raises the question of France's *motive*. If, taking advantage of the antagonism between Albany and Cornwall,¹ he planned

¹ This antagonism is an undeveloped motive in the play, either because Shakespeare was content only to hint at it, or because he found he lacked room for elaboration. (Most critics seem to assume the latter, but I am by no means sure they are right.) There are, of course, several clear statements on the subject: Curan reports 'likely wars toward 'twixt the Dukes of Cornwall and Albany' (II, i, 11), Kent knows of 'division' and 'snuffs and packings of the dukes', 'Although as yet the face of it is covered With mutual cunning' (I fancy he derives his information from Cordelia's letter, since he mentions the matter in connexion with the French spies, III, i, 19-25); and so does Gloucester: 'There is division between the dukes' (III, iii, 9). Some rivalry between them may be implied in the opening lines of the play, and though there is little confirmation to be found elsewhere, it is possible to detect at least two hints. Thus, when Gloucester speaks of Cornwall as 'The noble duke my master, My worthy arch and patron' (II, i, 60), he may mean that he is in some way bound to his party; and when later in the same scene Cornwall takes Edmund into his service with the words, 'Natures of such deep trust we shall much need' (117), there can be little doubt, I think, that he has the 'likely wars' with Albany in mind, for as yet he knows nothing of the

invasion as soon as he returned to his own kingdom, it was not planned to avenge the treatment Lear had received at the hands of his elder daughters, as we are later led to believe, and as is essential for any sympathetic feeling towards the invaders. As they affect this issue the time-data are much clearer, and what is important, they are presented directly to the apprehension of the spectator. Lear's quarrel with Goneril ends act I, that with Regan ends act II, the landing of the French army is known certainly in III, II, on the night of the second quarrel, probably in II, II, before it took place. The two quarrels were in fact on consecutive days, though this is a matter of calculation only: how far can the interval between them be imaginatively extended? If we stretch to the full Kent's words, 'Is it two days since I tripped up thy heels and beat thee before the king?' (II, II, 31), two or three days would seem to be the limit. But the impression received by the spectator is certainly one of haste; he will probably assume that only one night intervenes. Any lengthy interval is out of the question. Moreover, on the day of the second quarrel the letters reporting the invasion have already arrived: they must have taken at least as long to come from Dover as Kent, Lear, and Goneril took to come from Albany's. It is, therefore, difficult to escape the conclusion that at the time of Lear's quarrel with Goneril (*a fortiori* at that of his quarrel with Regan) the French army must have been in the act of landing, if not already landed, and this conclusion does not depend on any nice calculation from the time-data, but must be at once obvious to spectators.¹

designs of France. The rivalry was between the dukes, not, as Bradley has it (p. 250, note 3), between Goneril and Regan. there is no hint of any quarrel between the sisters till Edmund comes to the fore. As to the part played by the 'likely wars' in provoking the French invasion, Granville-Barker thinks that 'Kent, in an involved speech in Act III [I, 17 ff.] (for him most uncharacteristically involved), suggests that it is the threat of them which is bringing the French army to England' (p. 148). The speech is obscure, and probably incomplete as well as in part perhaps corrupt, but this interpretation I think puts the importance of the 'division' too high; it may have been the occasion, hardly the cause, of France's action.

¹ I here put the argument at its lowest. There are two sources of information respecting the invasion, namely the letters received by Kent and Gloucester respectively. Gloucester got his late on the day of the quarrel with Regan, probably just after it occurred: 'I have received a letter this night. there's part of a power already footed' (III, III, 10). The news it contains is 'mighty business' (III, v, 17), no less than that 'the army of France is landed' (III, VII, 2), and not merely afoot. Kent's letter was in his hands at least twelve hours earlier, before dawn the same day, and might be supposed to contain less recent information. It was 'from Cordelia' who was seeking 'to give losses their remedies' (II, II, 173-7). This is vague; but it is clearly on the strength of the same letter that Kent informed the Gentleman that the French 'have secret feet In some of our best ports, and are at point To shew their open banner', and that Cordelia is at Dover (III, I, 32, 36, 46). Kent's information, therefore, is practically the same as Gloucester's. Either of these might have imparted it to Lear's followers, who 'Are gone with him toward Dover, where they boast To have well-armed friends' (III, VII, 19). Now, when Kent reads the letter (in the stocks) he has only just arrived at Gloucester's after posting hard all night, and it is difficult to understand how he can have received it at any time after he left Albany's, which was immediately upon

This is borne out from another angle by IV, III, a scene (preserved in the Quarto only) between Kent after his arrival at Dover and the Gentleman whom he had sent ahead on the night of the storm to inform Cordelia of the treatment suffered by her father, and who now reports the result of his mission. What previous news or rumours Cordelia may have heard we cannot tell, but this was, of course, the first report she had received of the final quarrel with Regan: and she had been already some time encamped at Dover. When therefore France and Cordelia planned their invasion they cannot possibly have known of Lear's rejection by his elder daughters, for the simple reason that it had not yet happened. What then can be the justification of Cordelia's boast at IV, IV, 27?—

No blown ambition doth our arms incite,
But love, dear love, and our aged father's right.

To answer this riddle we must examine France's conduct more closely. In the first scene of all he appears as the romantic young lover eager to accept the dowerless Cinderella, while the more materially-minded, and we may suppose older, Burgundy stands upon 'respect and fortunes' (251). He is fully and fairly warned by the angry father (211):

For you, great king,
I would not from your love make such a stray,
To match you where I hate;

and he makes his election up with his eyes open (259):

Thy dowerless daughter, king, thrown to my chance,
Is queen of us, of ours, and our fair France:
Not all the dukes of waterish Burgundy
Can buy this unprized precious maid of me.

He had no cause to complain, and he gives no hint of complaint. Lear, however, is not best pleased (265):

Thou hast her, France; let her be thine, for we
Have no such daughter, nor shall ever see
That face of hers again: therefore be gone
Without our grace, our love, our benison.

Whether the last words are addressed to France or to Cordelia, they clearly do not invite parley. It therefore comes as a surprise when later on Goneril remarks that 'There is further compliment of leave-taking between France and' the king (306). It seems unlikely after what we have just heard, nor is it easy to see how Goneril, who has not left the stage, can know what is taking place outside. On the other hand, Lear

Lear's quarrel with Goneril. Moreover, Cordelia, informed of his 'obscured course', would of course have sent the letter to Albany's, where Lear was resident, no doubt through one of the spies she had planted in his house (III, I, 24). There can be no doubt, therefore, that the French army had actually landed before Lear had any quarrel with his daughters.

and Burgundy have gone off arm in arm ('Come noble Burgundy', 269), and it is a certain guess that between them there will be 'further compliment of leave-taking'. I should, therefore, have no hesitation in assuming (with Hanmer) that 'France' was here an error for 'Burgundy', were it not for the curious remark that Gloucester makes at the beginning of I, ii (23):

Kent banished thus¹ and France in choler parted!

There was no hint of choler in France when we last saw him. Considering, however, the mood Lear was in, if France had been indiscreet enough to seek a further interview, there would have been every chance of an explosion. I therefore feel bound to assume that such further leave-taking there was, and that France—'the hot-blooded France' of II, IV, 215—incensed at some fresh insult to Cordelia, departed in a rage, determined to wrest by force her portion from the favoured 'son-in-laws', Albany and Cornwall.

Such is the situation when France and Cordelia land at Dover. But it is impossible to imagine the gentle Cordelia spurring on her husband to the recovery of her portion. She would have been much more likely to urge submission to her father's unjust decree: she is the very pattern of obedience and love. What then can she mean by what she says at IV, IV, 23?—

O dear father,
It is thy business that I go about;
Therefore great France
My mourning and importuned tears hath pitied.

She is apparently trying to say that France has at her request come to the rescue of her father. But, as we have seen, the invasion cannot have been planned to avenge wrongs that had not yet been committed; consequently it cannot have been at Cordelia's entreaty that it took place. There can be only one explanation: what Cordelia's 'mourning and importuned tears' brought about was not the original expedition, but a change in its purpose.

And this change of purpose is, I think, clearly indicated by France's hasty return to his own country. No doubt this was in itself convenient for Shakespeare. There was less shock to patriotism in an invading army led by a British princess than by a French king. But Shakespeare need never have brought France over at all. Besides, the excuse given for his return is childish.¹ France left his kingdom in such a hurry that he

¹ Granville-Barker calls it 'a lame explanation' (p. 228), given in 'the clumsiest few lines in the play' (p. 148), which it is. He also says, 'It is a carpentered scene if ever there was one', and 'I could better believe that Shakespeare cut it than wrote it' (p. 228). Here too one may agree, with the qualification that the scene being in the Quarto only is probably not as Shakespeare wrote it.

altogether forgot about some pressing danger, and had to scurry back to meet it (iv, iii, 3)¹ The public explanation was, no doubt, on these lines, but (unless Shakespeare is being more perfunctory than we have any right to assume) we can hardly be intended to take it at its face value. The real reason, I suggest, was that Cordelia succeeded in persuading her husband to abandon his purpose of wresting a portion of the kingdom for himself and retire to his own land, thus leaving her free to use his army in defence of her father, should the occasion arise. She says in effect: 'It is for my father's safety (not my own inheritance) that I am fighting; that I am able to do so is due to my husband's granting my prayer (and giving up his own plan of conquest)'. And now indeed she has the right to add:

No blown ambition doth our arms incite,
But love, dear love, and our aged father's right.

This would, of course, be clearer if it could be shown that France's return followed on the Gentleman's report of Lear's ill-treatment. But we are expressly told that the opposite was the case: 'Was this [your report] before the king returned?—No, since' (iv, iii, 39). Kent goes out of his way to ask whether the departure of the French king was due to the news he had sent, and he is told that it was not. There must be some definite reason for this precise, and at first sight irrelevant, information. I think it is this. Had France's change of plan occurred on receipt of the news that Lear was in need of succour, it might have appeared no more than a change of tactics. Shakespeare wanted to make it quite clear that France, yielding to Cordelia's entreaty, had in fact already abandoned his own claim and its prosecution. It was in token of this fact that the king himself immediately retired to France. We may suppose that he left his marshal, La Far, behind to bring over the army after him. But Cordelia, whom we may suppose to have had her own suspicions, also remained behind, and thus, when the crisis came, was able to use the army for a purpose quite different from that for which it had been levied.

No doubt all this elaboration of motive proved too cumbersome of development at this point in the play's action. The hints that survive are in a scene that was in fact cut out of the Folio text. It was, moreover, wisely cut, for the motivation, though it might be dramatically important, was theatrically embarrassing.¹ It would be enough for spectators that the French king should in fact be absent, and that Cordelia should make

¹ Granville-Barker remarks (p. 149, note) that the scene appears to have been cut 'on the principle—and it is an excellent one in the theatre—of: "Never explain, never apologise."'

her protestation of disinterested love—they would ask no inconvenient questions. Still the hints remain in the text for us to read, and if we had the complete play as Shakespeare originally wrote it—or perhaps only drafted or designed it—we should I suspect find the motives and even the action less obscure.

W. W. GREG.

GEORGE DYER AND ENGLISH RADICALISM

To see the gentle George Dyer placed among even the milder radicals will surprise those acquainted with him only as the friend of Charles Lamb (and there are few who know him otherwise); for Lamb has immortalized him by dwelling almost exclusively upon the unconscious comedy of his outer life. The oddities of his character have likewise been the engrossing topic of his other friends and of those of our own time who have written about him.¹ The only recognition of George Dyer's extensive contribution to the liberal thought of his time which I have been able to find in all that has been written about him, is contained in a single sentence of the obituary notice in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for May 1841: 'His kind heart most warmly sympathized at all times with the cause of civil and religious liberty, which he uniformly espoused by his writings, more especially by his work on *The Theory and Practice of Benevolence* and a treatise entitled *Complaints of the Poor*.' But this gives little idea of the range of his thinking. Lamb has explored his heart for us, but has left no adequate intellectual estimate of him. In fact, by his minute chronicling of Dyer's harmless foibles he has spoiled the perspective upon his work. There is not a line of appreciation in Lamb about his political and religious philosophy. To Lamb, George Dyer was primarily a queer specimen in the laboratory of human nature. And yet he undoubtedly loved him; he wrote that he never spoke of him 'except *con amore*'. Lamb's respect and even reverence for Dyer, it is true, have been often

¹ See the following: Mary and Charles Cowden Clarke, *Recollections of Writers* (New York, 1878), pp. 11-13. *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, edited by Ernest Hartley Coleridge (Boston, 1895), I, 84, 93, 316-17, 363; II, 748-50. *Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, edited by Earl Leshe Griggs (London, 1932), I, 21-2, 32-4, 102, 125. Barry Cornwall, *An Autobiographical Fragment* (Boston, 1877), pp. 77-80 and *Charles Lamb, A Memoir* (London, 1866), pp. 69-71. Joseph Cottle, *Reminiscences of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Robert Southey* (London, 1847), pp. 155-7. William Hazlitt, *On the Look of a Gentleman and On the Conversation of Authors*. Leigh Hunt, *Autobiography* (New York, 1850), I, 70. *Letters of Charles and Mary Lamb*, edited by E. V. Lucas (London, 1921), I, 33, 134-5, 176, 180-3, 186-9, 209-10, 218, 234-40, 309-10, 523-4, 530, 547-8; II, 673-4, 710, 741, 847, 864-5, 925-6, 942, 975. Charles Lamb, *Oxford in the Vacation and Amicus Redivivus. Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson*, edited by Thomas Sadler (Boston, 1869), I, 39-40, 239-40; II, 472, 519. *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, edited by J. W. Warton (London, 1856), I, 33, 335. T. N. Talfourd, *Final Memorials of Charles Lamb* (Philadelphia, 1855), pp. 250-2, 261-3. Orlo Williams, *Life and Letters of John Rickman* (Boston, 1912), pp. 7, 59, 82.

For modern accounts of Dyer see the following: E. V. Lucas, *Life of Charles Lamb* (London, 1921), Chapter xiv. Dudley Wright, 'Charles Lamb and George Dyer', *English Review*, xxxix, 390-7 (September 1924). G. A. Anderson, 'Lamb and the Two G. D.'s', *London Mercury*, xi, 371-87 (February 1925). Edmund Blunden, 'Ella's G. D.', *London Nation and Athenaeum*, xliii, 138-9 (May 5, 1928). A. Edward Newton, *George Dyer* (1938), a privately printed brochure.

discounted because he so frequently made his friend the object of raillery, but his playfulness was always at the expense of the accidents, not of the essence, of Dyer's character. He was a convenient butt for good-natured ridicule and the tolerant object of some of the most delightful humour that has ever graced the English tongue. So perhaps more literature has been made about Dyer than he made himself. His many eccentricities are sauce to the bare facts of his uneventful life: his unassailable innocence, his amazing credulity, his bookishness, his absentmindedness, his slovenliness, his economy pushed to the point of denying himself proper nourishment, were sources of endless amusement to his friends and provided Lamb especially a constant temptation.

Lamb said that a biography of Dyer would be as interesting as any novel, and that he planned to put him in a novel if he outlived him. Strange to say, the biography has never been written. Even his autobiography, which in the blindness of his old age he dictated during the last seven years of his life, has been unfortunately lost, though there is an extract from it in the obituary sketch of the *Gentleman's Magazine*. So the records of his always laborious and generous-hearted and sometimes distinguished endeavours he scattered in the lumber-rooms of literature. It is the hope of the author of this study, though he has had to accept the handicap of writing soberly about a man whose lack of humour was said to 'amount to a positive endowment', to show that George Dyer was a respectable force in the progressive thought of his time and that, though he shines now in the reflected light of the genius of greater men who were his friends, the light of his own genius kept him, while living, from being obscured in contact with them.

Dyer's political and religious philosophy was steadied by the ballast of his great classical learning, in which, like his radical friend, Gilbert Wakefield, he was a marvel of industry. His works all have the air of serious scholarship. Lamb pays tribute to his 'fine erudition'. The simplicity upon which so many have remarked involved no lack of knowledge but was limited to his personal relations, though his scholarship was multifarious rather than profound. Leigh Hunt calls him 'an angel of the dusty bookstalls and of the British Museum'. Hazlitt has left us an engaging portrait of him as an unworldly bibliophile:

He hangs like a film and cobweb upon letters, or is like the dust upon the outside of knowledge, which should not be too rudely brushed aside. He follows learning as its shadow, but as such he is respectable. He browses on the husks and leaves of books.... The legend of good women is to him no fiction. When he steals from the twilight of his cell, the scene breaks upon him like an illuminated missal, and all the people he sees are but so many figures in a *camera obscura*.... His mind cannot take the impression of

vice; but the gentleness of his nature turns gall to milk....He draws the picture of mankind from the guileless simplicity of his own heart.¹

Much of what Dyer wrote is buried under anonymity in the mere projects of booksellers or in such magazines as the *Analytical Review*, the *Critical Review*, the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and the *Monthly Magazine*. Circumstances condemned him to much hard literary labour without inspiration and left the blight of dullness upon much of his literary output. However, when dealing with subjects in which his convictions were enlisted, like most of the great public questions of the early period of the French Revolution, he wrote with vigour and perspicuity and often with grace. And he never reached the borders of rant. Upon matters of political and religious controversy he seemed to feel, like Godwin, what Wordsworth has called 'the central calm subsisting at the heart of endless agitation'. In fact, few men have delivered themselves of radical ideas with more soberness. As a writer in the *Monthly Review* notes, his use of obsolete phrases gives his prose 'the air of an old sermon of the seventeenth century'. But there is in his pages little of the unconsciously mirth-provoking qualities that sauced his conversation, and Lamb praised some of his prose.

Dyer's poetry naturally suffers more than his prose from the pervasive soberness of his nature. E. V. Lucas writes that it is 'just so many sober words in metre'. The epigram of Crabb Robinson's friend Reid was considered just by many:

The world all say, my gentle Dyer,
Thy odes do very much want fire.
Repair the fault, my gentle Dyer,
And throw thy odes into the fire.²

Lamb's ridicule of Dyer's critical pretensions and of his poetical discrimination has led to the complete neglect of his poetry and even to an imperfect knowledge of its extent.³ But Lamb's opinions themselves are to be discounted to some degree from the very fact that he himself was incapable of soberness and that he always so warmed to his subject when he spoke of 'G.D.' that what went into him fact did not always come out truth. The denial to Dyer of a cultivated taste is not so well justified as the denial to him of imaginative vigour. Pegasus, it is true, generally 'runs restive' with our poet. There can be little imaginative glow in

¹ *Collected Works of William Hazlitt*, edited by Waller and Glover (London, 1902-6), vii, 43-4.

² *Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson*, i, 40.

³ Dudley Wright, for example, leaves the impression that he published only two volumes of poetry (*op. cit.* p. 395). He published four. On George Dyer as a poet and critic, see *Letters of Charles and Mary Lamb*, edited by E. V. Lucas (New Haven, 1935), i, 141, 201, 205, 211-12, 217, 247; ii, 242.

poems full of borrowed sentiments conscientiously acknowledged in ubiquitous footnotes. But a careful reading of his essays published in *Poems*, 1802, on 'representative', lyric, and elegiac poetry, indicates poverty neither of knowledge nor of discrimination. Unlike the average of his early contemporaries, he was no abject follower of Pope. He sometimes achieves the unaffected simplicity of Wordsworth's blank verse, and he is full of the humanitarian fervour of the early romantic poets.¹

We now turn to pertinent facts about George Dyer's career, especially those of his association with the leaders of liberal thought.

The association of the name of Dyer with Lamb begins with their attendance at Christ's Hospital, which was the early intellectual nurse also of their friends Coleridge and Leigh Hunt. Through the kindness of 'some charitable dissenting ladies' Dyer was sent to the famous charity school at nine. He stayed there twelve years and was for some time at the head with the rank of Grecian. But he had left long before Lamb entered in 1782, and had graduated in 1778 at Emmanuel College, Cambridge.² Upon taking his degree he submitted to subscription, though with misgivings sufficient, it is thought, to have caused him to be denied a fellowship. Soon afterward he was sent by the Baptist Fund in London as a pupil to the Rev. Robert Robinson in Cambridge, presumably to be trained for the dissenting ministry. Robinson, a brilliant man with whom Dyer had first become acquainted while an undergraduate and whose life he was later to write, was destined to run the whole gamut of dissent. Through Robinson's influence Dyer was led to unitarianism and, it seems, to political free-thinking as well. Robinson was an admirer of Voltaire and Rousseau. About 1780 he founded the Cambridge branch of the Society for Constitutional Information, a society for political reform which was later very sympathetic toward French revolutionary principles. In this society Robinson preached

¹ Good examples of both these qualities will be found in his poem 'To Mr Arthur Aikin, on taking Leave of him after a Pedestrian Tour' (*Monthly Magazine*, v, 121-3, February 1798).

² The mistaken impression was long received that Lamb and Dyer were schoolfellows at Christ's Hospital. It seems to have been originally given by Lamb himself in a letter to Dyer 22 February 1831: 'I don't know how it is, but I keep my rank in fancy still since schooldays. I can never forget that I was a deputy Grecian! And writing to you, or to Coleridge, besides affection, I feel a reverential deference as to Grecians still.' Lamb, looking back upon Christ's Hospital forty-three years after, associates his deference as a deputy Grecian for Coleridge, who was a contemporary Grecian (Coleridge became a Grecian in 1788, Lamb left the school in 1789), with that for Dyer, who was a Grecian before Lamb was born. Talfourd confirmed the error by writing that Dyer 'had attained the stately rank of Grecian in the venerable school of Christ's Hospital when Charles entered it' (*op cit.* p. 261). Leslie Stephen repeated it after him in his article on Dyer in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

civil and religious liberty, at the same time carrying his message to 'a little society of dissenters at Oxford'. Dyer, though he did not join the society, undoubtedly approved of its purpose. His political interest was probably stimulated about this time too through his acquaintanceship with the doughty political reformer, 'Citizen' Earl Stanhope, in whose home he was for a while¹ a tutor and who, upon his death in 1816, made Dyer, with Fox and others, one of his executors and left him a handsome legacy.

In 1781 Dyer tried preaching, serving a dissenting congregation at Oxford, probably the 'little society' to which his friend Robinson had preached the gospel of liberty the year before. But he soon returned again to Cambridge, where he took residence among the fellows; attracted the attention of Priestley, Wakefield, and Mrs Barbauld; and for the next ten years was one of that influential group of Cambridge dissenters which for more than thirty years made a valiant fight for the removal of political and religious disabilities. Besides Robert Robinson, this group included at various times Robert Tyrwhitt, John Jebb, William Frend, Robert Hall, and Benjamin Flower.² During the preceding twenty-five years the dissenters had not without patience won a certain amount of respect at Cambridge.³ However, while the atmosphere of Cambridge was in the 1780's more conducive to freedom of thought than that of Oxford (Oxford required subscription for entrance; Cambridge, for graduation), even there dissenters were looked upon with suspicion and dislike. But Dyer was hopeful. He wrote of the period in 1793:

From the temper of the studies pursued at Cambridge as well as from the great degree of liberality possessed by many of its members, there were not wanting those who hoped a disposition might prevail there to rectify some of its more glaring impositions begotten originally by tyranny and nursed by weakness.⁴

Accordingly, in 1789 he threw himself into the then much accelerated agitation against all the disabilities of dissenters with his *Inquiry into the Nature of Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles*. Robinson and Capel Lofft drew up the plan of a college for dissenters at Cambridge in which

¹ Just when is uncertain. The obituary notice in the *Gentleman's Magazine* states that he engaged in 'private tutoring' before he entered the home of Robinson.

² Dyer has left us interesting observations on the reforming activities of these men in the chapter on 'Dissentients' of his *History of the University and Colleges of Cambridge, including Notices relating to the Founders and Eminent Men* (1814), I, 114-29, and in his *Privileges of the University of Cambridge* (1824), II, 99, 107.

³ Dyer tells us that in the beginning of Robinson's ministry in 1757 dissenters were regarded as 'degraded characters' at Cambridge. The undergraduates were given to interrupting the meetings of dissenters about the town so much that one parish prosecuted the offenders. On one occasion about 1769 in St Andrew's Church 'prostitutes paraded the aisles in academic habits' (*Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Robert Robinson*, p. 72).

⁴ *Complaints of the Poor People of England*, p. 94.

it was their desire that Dyer should become a tutor, but Robinson died in 1790 before it was realized.

After a short period of teaching at Southampton with the father of Charles Cowden Clark in 1791, Dyer, apparently seeking a wider field of intellectual endeavour,¹ went to London in the next year and in 1795 settled at Clifford's Inn, where, as Lamb puts it, 'like a dove in an asp's nest' he lived 'in calm and sinless peace' for the remaining forty-six years of his life.

The main part of the record of these forty-six years will be found in his books. It has to do almost exclusively with adventures of the mind. His outward activity was practically narrowed to exertions on behalf of his friends, nearly all of whom were at one time or another closely identified with the forward-looking movements of the age. He became a member of the Chapter House Coffee Club, to which belonged many of the celebrities of the day. Before the campaign for the suppression of the revolutionary societies became so violent in 1792, he attended several of them and 'almost constantly attended one of their committees formed by delegates from various societies'.² In 1790 Gilbert Wakefield, his contemporary at Cambridge, came to teach in the dissenting college at Hackney, from which he loosed the tumult of his soul upon the government. They indulged together 'some kindred likings and some kindred scorns', and when Wakefield's fanaticism brought the ire of officialdom down upon his head and sent him to prison in 1799, Dyer defended his friend's principles. After his expulsion from Cambridge in 1793, the reformer William Frend joined Dyer in London and continued to his death, only a few days before Dyer's, the close association begun at the university. As we shall see, Dyer's sympathy for men persecuted for opinion's sake in 1793 and 1794—Winterbotham, Muir, Palmer, Walker, Gerrald, Hodgson, Hardy, Tooke, Thelwall, Holcroft, Joyce—was openly expressed. The Rev. Thomas Fyshe Palmer was a particular friend of both Robinson and Dyer. Dyer was not afraid to speak of him in 1796 as 'that honourable exile now bearing his faithful testimony to truth at Botany Bay'.³

Of the young liberal intellectuals who were later to make literary history, the first Dyer came to know was Coleridge. 'As a "brother

¹ For the circumstances of the severance of his connexion with the dissenting society at Cambridge, to most of whom his unitarianism and his political views seemed extreme, see appendix to the second edition of the *Inquiry*.

² *Op. cit.* p. 81.

³ *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Robert Robinson*, p. 249. See also his *Account of New South Wales and State of the Convicts* and his preface to George Thompson's *Slavery and Famine, Punishments for Sedition*, both published in 1794, for his condemnation of the severity of recent sentences against radicals.

Grecian"', writes E. H. Coleridge,¹ 'he was introduced to Coleridge in 1794, . . . and probably through him became intimate with Lamb and Southey.' Dyer favoured Coleridge's scheme of pantisocracy and thought his friend Priestley, who had already sailed for America, would join it. While the young poet was rapturously dreaming of this Utopia and looking in London for a publisher for *The Fall of Robespierre* in the late summer of 1794, he was befriended by Dyer, who disposed of some of his 'nonsense' to the booksellers. Dyer's benevolence was substantially shown again a few weeks later when he bought twenty-five copies of the poem himself, having found it 'inconvenient to take fifty'.² Later in the year it is thought that Dyer tried to obtain for him a tutorship in the Erskine family. He also generously commended Coleridge's *Conciones ad Populum*. Their friendship seems not to have been affected by Coleridge's later change of front in political and religious philosophy. On 6 June 1828, Coleridge wrote him an affectionate letter inviting him to tea along with Basil Montagu and addressing him in those terms of admiration which only Coleridge could use so well.

E. H. Coleridge's conjecture that it was through Coleridge that Dyer became intimately acquainted with Lamb and Southey seems a safe one. The first mention of Dyer in Lamb's letters is made in a letter to Coleridge, 1 July 1796, in which he speaks of Dyer's having 'stanza'd' Horne Tooke 'in one of the papers t'other day'. Their common passion for books, though very differently expressed, no doubt had much to do in drawing them together. Their contact after 1800 became and continued frequent and steady. Dyer, who seems to have had a remarkable *entrée* to booksellers and publishers, cemented his friendships with young men wherever possible by gaining them recognition. He reviewed Lamb's works for the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and in 1801 he obtained for him an introduction to the *Morning Chronicle*. In the preceding year he had obtained for Lamb's friend, John Rickman, to whom he had introduced Lamb, the editorship of the *Commercial, Agricultural, and Manufacturer's Magazine*.

There are few memorials of the friendship of Dyer and Southey, long as it was. Southey's headlong reaction from the revolutionary philosophy

¹ *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, II, 748n.

² *Ibid.* I, 93. See also *ibid.* I, 84 and *Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, edited by E. L. Griggs, I, 21-2. In a letter of early 1795 to Dyer, Coleridge exclaims 'God love you, my very dear Sir! I would that we could form a Pantisocracy in England and that you could be one of us' (*ibid.* I, 33). If this had come to pass, Coleridge would have undoubtedly tested Dyer's benevolence thoroughly. E. K. Chambers thinks that Dyer paid the sum of £80 to £90 to extricate the poet from the financial difficulties in which the demise of the *Watchman* left him in May 1796. (*Samuel Taylor Coleridge, A Biographical Study*, Oxford, 1938, pp. 56-7, 335.)

seems gradually to have taken him away from Dyer's circle. In 1797 he was made acquainted by Dyer with Mary Hays, then a conspicuous disciple of Godwin, and spoke deprecatingly of her ideas. Dyer's sketch of Southey in *Public Characters* for 1799-1800 stresses with a touch of impatience the volatile character of his opinions at the time and the manner of decision in which he expressed them. 'Whatever his opinions may be for the time, he never conceals them, and is cautious that other people should not mistake them.'¹ The feeling of the later Southey about Dyer's political philosophy undoubtedly was in harmony with that expressed to him by his life-long and notoriously conservative friend Rickman in a facetious and depreciatory passage of a letter of 5 August 1802:

Dyer... has lately been profitably employed.... He has been on Sir Francis Burdett's Committee,² reckoning himself and Sir Francis allied because the said Sir Francis talked about the Bastille and G. D. wrote a book entitled the *Complaints of the Poor*.³

Crabb Robinson, who met Dyer in 1799 and who seems to have had a knack for being wherever there was good talk, was his occasional companion, especially after Dyer became blind, when he sometimes read for him on Sunday mornings. An entry in his diary for 27 February 1812 tells of a dinner at Thelwall's in company with Friend and Dyer. But Lamb's chambers in Inner Temple Lane, where he resided from 1809 to 1817, were the favourite rendezvous of George Dyer and his friends. Crabb Robinson writes of a party there—'a numerous and odd set they were, for the greater part interesting and amusing people'—on 15 June 1815, in which among others were Dyer, Barron Field, Captain and Martin Burney, Phillips the publisher, Hazlitt, Kirke White, John Collier, Charles Lloyd, and Basil Montagu. Talfourd has sketched Dyer among his friends in that unforgettable pen-picture⁴ of a typical Wednesday evening whist party at the Lambs', when thoughts that wander through eternity were bandied up and down and the philosophy of social and political progress, then fallen upon evil days, was buoyed up to await the flood tide of fortune not to come until some fifteen or twenty years later.

We pass now to an analysis and estimate of that large part of Dyer's writings which links him with the revolutionary tradition.

¹ P. 111.

² This indicates that Dyer took an active part in Burdett's much contested election in 1802 to a seat in Parliament for Middlesex over Mainwaring. Dyer not only was in sympathy with Burdett's leadership in the campaign for parliamentary reform but he had been no doubt aroused by Mainwaring's strenuous resistance against the inquiry into prison abuses.

³ *Life and Letters of John Rickman*, edited by Orlo Williams, p. 82.

⁴ *Final Memorials of Charles Lamb*, pp. 250-4.

An Inquiry into the Nature of Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles was the first of Dyer's publications. It was originally issued in pamphlet form in 1789, but was not advertised for sale and was circulated only among a few friends. In the first edition he did not even allude to affairs in France, since they were then 'suspended on the edge of contingencies'. The second edition, 'corrected, altered and much enlarged', came from the press of the radical bookseller Joseph Johnson in 1792. It is a book of 439 pages which, in the words of a reviewer in the *Monthly Review*,¹ 'exposes, perhaps more fully than any former publication has done, the apprehended absurdities and mischiefs attending religious tests'. It was, in fact, the culmination of the arguments in support of the proposal for the repeal of the obnoxious Corporation and Test Acts, the long fight against which had been given an extraordinary impetus during the early period of the French Revolution. He tells us in the preface that he had planned to make further 'copious remarks' on the part of Burke's *Reflections* connected with his subject, but that he had desisted, 'recollecting... that as he had been sufficiently confuted on the subject of French politics by Mr Paine and since by Mr Christie and Mr Mackintosh, he had also been ably replied to on those matters which took my attention by Dr Priestley and others.'² So he dismisses Burke as 'a writer whose flashy rather than correct style has gained him some admirers, but whose principles are approved by few who have no interest in being deceived.'³ The book, however, is multifarious enough in its range of subject-matter. All the political and religious ramifications of subscription are traced. Its style is marked by diffuse eloquence rather than by close logic. But the weight of Dyer's learning is carried with more grace and spirit than he usually shows.

In the four parts of the *Inquiry* he condemns subscription as inconsistent with natural rights, with the free exercise of the intellectual powers, with the principles of the British constitution, and with the doctrines of Christianity, respectively. We are here primarily concerned with the first two.

¹ x, 77 (January 1793).

² Thomas Christie's *Letters on the French Revolution*, James Mackintosh's *Vindiciae Gallicae*, and Joseph Priestley's *Letters to Burke* were, next to Paine's *Rights of Man*, all of which had been published in the early months of 1791, the most vigorous and able of the scores of answers to Burke's *Reflections*.

³ P. vii of the preface of the second edition. All the quotations from the *Inquiry* are taken from this edition. To Burke's contemptuous reference to the 'intriguing philosophers' and 'theological politicians' among the dissenters, Dyer retorts: 'If under such a government as that of England, there were not among the dissenters men of the above description, dissenters would be contemptible petists, dreaming monks, spiritless slaves, or unmanly sycophants' (p. 287).

Dyer's conception of natural rights is little related to Rousseau's. Dyer defines them as 'claims arising out of our present situation, our mutual relation, and our common equality'. He thus confuses Rousseau's natural and civil rights.¹ With Rousseau, natural rights do not arise from a civilized social condition or mutual relations but are anterior to the social state. According to Dyer, government protects civil rights and at the same time helps to preserve the true equality of the state of nature. Rousseau would not have subscribed to such a statement as this: 'As the wants of mankind are the foundation of society and as society gives birth to government, government is dictated by nature.' Natural rights, Dyer tells his readers, are determined, not by a blanket fiat of our Creator, but by 'the soil where ye received your origin'. The natural rights of the enlightened Englishman will, then, admit him to higher privileges than those of an American Indian or of a Chinese, though the rights of the Englishman are not more real.

Among these natural rights which religious tests deny are the right to occupy offices of public trust, the right to educate children on any national endowment, the right to publish opinion, and the right to the free use of reason especially in regard to religion. Such rights have a priority over systems of law and religion: 'As there is a primitive reason from whence proceed those relations which constitute law, there are also rights prior to any form of religion which are the foundation of liberty.'² Therefore, any scheme of religion which deprives men of them is to be condemned.

Considering the education of youth as a natural right, Dyer launches into an attack upon the aristocratic element and intolerance in the universities. His respect for man is stronger than his regard for the society of scholars. He hopefully looks forward to the establishment of national education, which will follow the revolution in the principles of education introduced by 'the spirit of modern politics'. He hails the establishment of the dissenting college at Hackney as a move toward this liberation of education. The comprehensive scheme of his educational toleration takes in even the Jews, whose admission to the universities he advocates. The statutes of the medieval founders of the universities, where they involve intolerance toward the dissenters, must 'submit to an interpretation which the age can bear'.

¹ Cf. Joel Barlow's idea that 'a perfect state of society is a perfect state of nature'. See the present author's 'Joel Barlow, Political Romanticist', *American Literature*, ix, 129 (May 1937).

² Pp. 16, 13, 14, 19-22, 45. The references to the quotations above are given in the order of the quotations, since they relate to the same general theme. The same is true of the grouped references which follow.

To the objection that the state must have 'a just and permanent security', Dyer replies that government provides its own security by guarding the social compact and that a mutual consent establishes the principles according to which just government is regulated. Like all revolutionary thinkers, he pitches his plea against subscription above the level of little groups of opinionative men upon the immovable basis of first principles:

These reasonings which plead the cause of mankind are not the partial arguments of a dissenter against a churchman..., but the unsophisticating and, I think, the unanswerable plea of human nature against every domineering influence. For I am very much mistaken if there be not a secret corner in the human heart, where sophistry cannot enter. into which, would we condescend to look,...subscription... will appear abhorrent from the first principles of natural justice and of common benevolence.¹

In his examination of the inconsistency between subscription and the powers of the human mind, he accepts the Hartleian refinement of Locke's sensationalism, though, as we shall see, he seems to balk at the system of materialism towards which it leads. One corollary of sensationalism which he fully accepts is disbelief in mysteries. We can have no ideas about things concealed from us. To ask one to believe such incomprehensible mysteries as consubstantiation and transubstantiation, or even original sin, the trinity, and grace, by laying aside the reason, is like asking one to see without eyesight. Faith can result only from evidence. Moreover, mystery itself is too often the cloak of knavery. As the path to political salvation is less complicated than lawyers make it seem, so the path to heaven is plainer than theologians make it appear. Again, following the sensationalists, Dyer does not admit free-will 'in the philosophical sense'. Accepting the idea that 'the mind is the effect of the organization of matter', he believes that 'the will follows irresistibly and necessarily the most powerful impressions'. But the darker implications of the ideas of predestination and election yield to those of infinite benevolence. He thinks that 'the grace of God will at length prevail over all, it being impossible that infinite benevolence should be defeated of its own gracious intentions'.² Hence all will eventually be 'made happy in God'. All are predestined to salvation: how could universal benevolence decree otherwise?

So much for Dyer's theory of the operations of the mind and the control of destiny. What about the relations between subscription and intellectual integrity? It is impossible for the average man to subscribe with integrity to the truth of thirty-nine propositions, involving meta-

¹ Pp. 60-1.

² P. 330.

physical distinctions, all the leading church doctrines held since the establishment of Christianity, and all the multifarious matters of church ceremony and faith on which the church has legislated. 'Such articles', he declares moreover, 'will become standards to which we shall appeal as oracles of truth rather than guides to help us in our inquiries after it.'¹ The variety of the human understanding, which becomes more and more evident with intellectual improvement, is irreconcilable with the uniformity of faith imposed by subscription.

Of the primacy of reason Dyer is an uncompromising advocate. He is convinced that all propositions to which people are asked to subscribe should be pursued to 'self-evident truths or the principles of common sense', and that otherwise they are not binding. If revelation counteracts the principles of reason, he can hardly be convinced that it is divine. 'If our establishments or even Christianity itself throw impediments in the way of the human understanding, . . . I shall not scruple to give them all up.' True intellectual freedom and a reverence for the understanding, then, will not endure any kind of subscription.

Subscription to any articles cannot be justified on any principle of reason; whatever be their number and wherever they be fabricated, . . . all alike tend to enslave the understanding and to retard the progress of truth.²

On historical grounds Dyer denies that the clergy are represented in parliament as an ecclesiastical body and that the church is an essential part of the English constitution. Parliamentary assemblies of the clergy have their origin in the accumulation of large temporal possessions by the bishops and clergy from the people in payment for spiritual services. Under William the Conqueror the tenures of the clergy underwent the same changes as the tenures of the nobles; that is, they have been held since 'by barony', not 'in free alms'. Hence the bishops sit in the House of Lords as barons rather than as representatives of the clergy, and the clergy as an organized ecclesiastical body are not only no estate in parliament but are not represented except in common with the laity, who are freeholders. This reasoning denies the bishops the presumption that they have the power to speak or legislate for the rank and file of the church. The church is no primary part of the English constitution; for the fundamental maxims of the English government are antecedent to the establishment just as the natural rights of mankind, which the fundamental maxims of the English government express, are 'antecedent to any particular regimen of religion'. There is nothing in the constitution, therefore, to render the union of church and state indissoluble.

¹ P. 70.

² Pp. 127-8, 131.

But more revealing of the real nature of Dyer's thinking in the *Inquiry* than such scholarly historical arguments are the frequently startling revolutionary sentiments which light up the sober colouring of his dispassionate pages and which he shares with the more outright contemporary radicals and agitators.

In his private convictions he went along quite a distance with his more explosive friend Wakefield. He professed the same personal aversion to public worship and believed that it gave a bias to religious inquiry. However, he does not go the length of Wakefield in contending that social worship is incompatible with the Christian religion. He commends Wakefield's and Geddes's translations of the New Testament as liberal yet accurate versions, which, unlike the King James version, do not 'give countenance to the claims of high church authority' or 'follow the expectations of a system'.

His speculative ideas on the lineage of absolute government and on the sovereignty of the people show the influence of the bold mind and trenchant pen of Thomas Paine. 'All monarchies, properly so called,' Dyer declares, 'originated in violence or corruption and their continuance depends upon the same principles which gave them their existence'.¹ The sovereignty of the people makes the monarch 'a public functionary only', and the divinity which hedges kings builds a sconce not only against the wall of heaven but against the very palladium of public liberty.

When Europeans speak of a sovereign lord, of a sacred majesty, of a defender of the faith, and the Lord's anointed, mankind are misled. The former term savours of conquest; the next of theological claims, the third of superstition, if not of something worse; the last is the incense of priests to the pride of kings.²

Here the sober temper of the inquirer gives way to the spleen of the agitator. In his ideas on hereditary legislators and the system of aristocracy, he alludes with approval to the *Rights of Man*, but they have more of the temperance of statement which makes it possible to reason with him than Paine's. He also cites Paine's and Joel Barlow's teachings about prelates and privileged orders; and he sees their ideas provoked by the inattention to distress, the tendency toward persecution, and the opposition to claims of conscience among the ruling classes. He sets up a hypothetical radical reformer behind whose downrightness he thinly

¹ P. 152.

² P. 263. On the last point he quotes with approval Mrs Catherine Macaulay, who at the time was pursuing radical ideas with as keen a mind and as irrepressible a vigour as Mary Wollstonecraft 'That the people might learn to kiss the rod of power with devotion and, becoming slaves by principle, learn to reverence the yoke, priests were instructed to teach speculative despotism and graft on religious affections systems of civil tyranny' (p. 438).

conceals his own convictions. These words, for example, purport to be typical of the agitators, but the thoughts none the less are George Dyer's:

Prelates are by office enemies to liberty and obstacles to the progress of truth.... Prelacy is founded in error and perpetuated by worldly policy.... 'Admit only the original unadulterated truth that all men are equal in their rights, and the foundation of everything is laid. To build the superstructure requires no effort but that of natural deduction.'¹

The most open instance of his alignment with the radicals then being suspected or hunted down by the government is his appending with approval in a long note the declaration of the revolutionary Society of United Irishmen at Dublin, signed by its notorious secretary Tandy. This declaration, Dyer writes, 'presents a model worthy of imitation in England'. In the same connexion he advocates the distribution of radical political pamphlets among 'the lower ranks of people', including 'cheap editions of Mr Paine's *Rights of Man*'. He also recommends to parents Locke's *Treatise on Education* and Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. In the latter he hails the advent of the rational woman. Finally, the revolutionary radicals' contempt for the past and his belief in the perfectibility which enfranchized man will achieve in the future, when 'reason has supplanted enthusiasm', are expressed with the true Godwinian temper:

Politics are capable of unknown degrees of improvement. Political wisdom is not wont to show itself in imitation, but... in rescuing truth from the rubbish of Gothic antiquity and political knavery.... The object in her eye is Man.... As present times come forward to her survey..., she sees liberty in the train while antiquity retires from her eye and vanishes in a point. Too well instructed to admire defects for their antiquity or to overlook improvement because incomplete, she advances with prudence yet with intrepidity, with humility yet with perseverance, with modesty yet with success. Happy to admit mistakes as well as to pursue discoveries, she yields without meanness and conquers without insolence; and thus never rests till she gains perfection. This, this is political wisdom.²

Dyer's first volume of poems came from Johnson's press the same year as the revised and enlarged edition of the *Inquiry*. It was a thin volume in pamphlet form, dedicated to William Frend to express his respect for him 'as a man of letters and, what I value more, as a man of virtue and a friend to liberty'. 'Ode on Peace, written in Jesus College Garden', contains tributes to Tyrwhitt, Frend, and Wakefield—the Cambridge reformers, who as 'steady friends of man' formed various generous plans for broadening liberty. An extensive portion of the 'Ode on Liberty' is

¹ Pp. 350–4. The last sentence is quoted from Barlow's *Address to the Privileged Orders*. Dyer accedes also to Barlow's quoted opinion that 'the church in all ages... hath aimed to establish spiritualism on the ruins of civil order' (p. 400).

² P. 254.

dedicated to such defenders of the French Revolution as John Jebb, Richard Price, Samuel Parr, John Aikin, Thomas Paine, Mary Hays, Helen Maria Williams, and Mary Wollstonecraft; and there are added long notes explaining in more detail their connexions with the cause of liberty. The stanza on Paine, written at the time when the *Rights of Man* was being acclaimed and condemned in such wholesale fashion, brought down upon the author the displeasure of the *Critical Review*.¹

The following year (1793) brought the publication of Dyer's *Complaints of the Poor People of England*. The spirit and purpose of this production had been anticipated in the preface to the *Inquiry*, where he describes himself as more interested in and better fitted for humanizing the order of society by the peaceful penetration of political knowledge among 'the outcasts of political society, the common people' than for more boldly 'abashing venal statesmen and startling unfeeling oppressors'. Again his title does not indicate the comprehensiveness of his book, which touches upon practically every matter of political agitation then stirring the country. Still, in a special way, it is a document instinct with humanitarian sentiment, a deep solicitude for the rights of the poor, and a sincere desire to lead them into a more abundant life. It is no speculative or doctrinaire performance, but a record of the observations and convictions of a man who has become as one of the poor to learn their problems and to appreciate their hardships. In spirit it is the most modern of all his productions.

The main defect of the English government from the point of view of the poor is the imperfect representation which denies them any share in the making of laws. Only about 12,000 people of a population of approximately 8,000,000 were eligible to vote for members of the House of Commons. The basis of representation had not been changed materially for more than a hundred years. The new growing industrial centres where the poor were concentrated were practically without representation, while the borough of Midhurst in Sussex, for example, though it had not then a single house, sent two members to parliament. Dyer fully outlines the consequences to the poor in tyranny and injustice. Responsibility for their ignorance is laid upon the government. Again he advocates a plan for national education, but calls it 'a romantic idea'. That the children of the rich and the poor should be taught in the same schools was a bold opinion in 1793. As Barlow had already pointed out in his *Advice to the Privileged Orders*, Dyer shows that the poor people are kept in ignorance of the laws largely by the fact that they are printed in the old German

¹ See second series, VII, 270-2.

character, which few can read, and sold at such a price that few can afford to buy. The tyranny of the game and penal laws, the extravagance of crown and church expenditure, and the ignoring of the rights of the poor in the administration of the army and navy, are dwelt upon—sometimes with high-spirited scorn, sometimes with deep indignation. To give to the poor the independence to which their rights as men entitle them, Dyer advocates the turning over of waste land to them and the establishment of life annuities according to a plan of Dr Price. The abolition of certain oppressive feudal rights, such as primogeniture, which have survived into an age whose enlightened spirit they constantly violate, will also contribute to the reduction of poverty.

‘An Address to the Friends of Liberty’, the title which Dyer gives to the fourth part of his book, is a bold protest against the government’s policy of suppression and a vigorous defence of the aims of the revolutionary societies. He declares his willingness to obey the laws in making which the majority have no share, but his inability to respect such a government. He asserts that the proclamations used to hamper the meetings of such organizations as the Constitutional and Corresponding societies are not laws, since they have not been ratified by parliament. He denies that the societies have any designs on property, commending Major Cartwright and Lord Daer for their solicitude, in forming some of the societies, about the security of property. But he defends the suspected correspondence carried on by some of them with the French revolutionary bodies, since it was in response to the invitation of the National Assembly to give their advice about the new French constitution. He ends the book with a reaffirmation of his faith in the French Revolution:

Yes, with few exceptions I approved and still approve the doctrines of the Rights of Man; and the French Revolution I contemplated and still contemplate as the most important era in the history of nations.¹

A Dissertation on the Theory and Practice of Benevolence, published in 1795, was intended as a sequel to the *Complaints of the Poor*. It is not in part, as the title might imply, a metaphysical examination of the origin of our moral feelings. It is primarily an attempt ‘unconnected with the science of casuistry’ to stimulate the spirit of benevolence by presenting objects for which it may be exercised: charity schools, workhouses, and various relief societies. Surely George Dyer comes nearer than any of the thinkers of the day to personifying that ‘universal benevolence’ of which

¹ P. 84.

the revolutionary philosophers so glibly talked.¹ At the same time he is careful not to suggest any radical interference with the system of property. In fact, he thinks benevolence must be relied upon to correct the inequalities and imperfections inseparable from the social state. Among the objects of benevolence proposed are the defendants in the state trials of 1794. Without their solicitation, he gives particular accounts of these sufferers in the cause of freedom. He is careful, however, to stress, not the political, but the moral point of view—'moral, not in regard to the justice or injustice of putting these persons on their trials nor to the principles or characters of the accusers, matters upon which he had his private opinions, but in regard to the inconveniences and losses sustained by the defendants'.² Even the ordinarily unsympathetic *Critical Review* was moved by admiration of Dyer's 'humane and sensible strictures' of the treatment of the men who had lately been indicted for treason and sedition.

Dyer's liberality of mind made him peculiarly fit to write the life of Robert Robinson, whose spirit of eager inquiry early led his disciple to venture into the field of rational religion. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Robert Robinson* was published in 1796. Dr Parr and Wordsworth thought it one of the best biographies in English. It also had the distinction of being translated into German. The book is examined here primarily for its reflexion of Dyer's more liberal ideas: there are many independent reflexions on the spirit of the age and on ecclesiastical and political affairs.

In the preface there is one of the most outright avowals of revolutionary ideas to be found in the whole range of Dyer's writings. The occasion, which seems rather incommensurate with the fervour of the philosophical comment which it engenders, is his decision not to use titles with the names of people in the *Memoirs*.

The language of equality is adopted in this volume; it is the language of truth and soberness. . . . In my intercourse with society I conform to its language; but in publications, at least for such as I am responsible, I will abide by the language of equality. In the latter case I bear a testimony to liberty: in the former I leave the reader to smile at my inconsistency. But, to speak the truth, these titles present a caricature of

¹ Lamb has left us, in his *Oxford in the Vacation*, an imitable tribute to this all-embracing and selfless charity of his friend: 'With G. D., to be absent from the body is sometimes (not to speak it profanely) to be present with the Lord. At the very time when personally encountering thee, he passes on with no recognition or, being stopped, starts like a thing surprised—at that moment, reader, he is on Mount Tabor or Parnassus or cosphered with Plato or with Harrington, framing 'immortal commonwealths', devising some plan of amelioration to thy country or thy species—peradventure meditating some individual kindness or courtesy to be done to *thee thyself*, the returning consciousness of which made him to start at thy obtruded personal presence.'

² *The Pamphleteer*, xiv, 75. The quotation is from a later printing of the *Dissertation* in *The Pamphleteer* for 1818 and 1819.

man, while every inch of ground he treads on, . . . every propensity of the human heart, whether virtuous or vicious, proves the deception and mocks our pride . . . France has emancipated mankind from these attempts at false greatness. By bursting the bars which imprison truth, she has aggrandized her species.¹

The plainness of his style in the book is largely explained by the fact that he is willing to appear 'among writers as a native of Botany Bay'.

Dyer's sympathy with Robinson's various political and religious heresies is implicit when not expressed. He writes with evident satisfaction of Robinson's Rousseauistic belief in the pristine purity of human nature and of his general approbation of the French Revolution. The little respect Dyer shows for the arcana of political science would have pleased the subject of his biography also. Like Paine, Dyer thinks that government has been made a matter of mystery by designing men who have used religion to bolster tyranny and have thus obscured the plain path of public happiness by a 'wilderness of turnpike gates'. His usual philosophic composure deserts him completely on this subject, and he writes as if he had just risen from a perusal of Paine:

There exists a class of lofty politicians by whom government is treated as priests treat religion, like a science too profound to be fathomed by common intellects or like a fabric too elegant and too sacred to be touched by the unclean, the unhallowed hands of the vulgar. The comprehension of political science, the arrangement and establishment of political institutions, are, according to these men, appointed by a divine invisible agent and transferred to the administration of a transcendent personage, his vice-gerent in this lower world. To augment the splendour of this august character, inferior dignities are called in, enclosed with the bright emblazonry of hereditary greatness, and decorated with the exterior pomp of official magnificence. These sagacious speculatists, like the ancient Epicureans who maintained that the liberty of the will flows from a right line out of a curve, reverse the interests and claims of a community, and become advocates of the crooked manoeuvrings of a few lucky spirits, fortunate by birth or blessed with affluence. In comparison with these politicians, how mere a novice was Aristotle! This philosopher did but resign the reins of government to such a nature had endowed with talents corresponding to the character of a governor. The other men possessed the holy oil by which even fools were made Solomons. The doctrine of Jus Divinum established tyranny and slavery by a commission from heaven.²

With little short of an implication of approval he quotes Paine's description of government as 'an evil that the wickedness of mankind renders necessary', and seems to agree with Godwin in doubting its positive blessing.

The year 1797 is marked by two attempts at verse satire. *The Poet's Fate*, a plea for a more liberal patronage of writers, is a rhymed dialogue between a neglected poet and his friend. Among the writers of radical tendency mentioned as ill repaid by the world for their exertions in its

¹ Pp. vii-ix.

² Pp. 221-2.

behalf are Parr, Aikin, Geddes, Frend and Wakefield. The following are two of several alternatives suggested by the despairing Muse:

Take poor repast;
For such as needs must write must learn to fast,
Take moderate exercise and keep upstairs;
When hungry, smoke your pipe or say your prayers;
Or plough in learned pride the Atlantic main,
Join Pantisocracy's harmonious train;
Haste where young Love still spreads his brooding wings,
And freedom digs and ploughs and sings.

In a note to the above Dyer compliments Southey and Coleridge for their 'ardent love of liberty' and 'the softer feelings of benevolence', and singles out Wordsworth, Lloyd, and Lamb for poetical distinction. In the same year he published *An English Prologue and Epilogue to the Latin Comedy of Ignoramus*,¹ with a Preface and Notes relative to modern Times and Manners. In the epilogue there is one of his rare indulgences in personal satire. The lines on the established clergy are biting and offensive enough.

Churchmen you think are *sacred*—be they so—
Witchcraft was sacred some few years ago...
Should some fools, and fools are often grave,
With solemn cant affect my soul to save;
With cheeks as fat as brawn, as soft as down,
With nothing reverend save the band and gown,
With eyes so full they cannot hold a tear,
And heads that never ached, except with beer;
Whose slender knowledge tells them to obey,
Dull idle souls who only preach and pray,...
Yes, I would claim as I have claimed before,
As fair a right to laugh as you to snore.
Peace on the Reverend head, however dull;
Go, honest man, enjoy your empty skull.

These productions, in general, confirm, however, what might have been concluded otherwise—that George Dyer was constitutionally unfit to be a satirist. There was too much kindness in his nature for him to satirize often with great effectiveness. In its review of *The Poet's Fate*, the *Monthly Review*² observes:

If it be possible for a satirist to be void of a single particle of ill-will toward any man breathing, or for a complainant against the times to be perfectly satisfied with his own lot, we firmly believe the humble and benevolent George Dyer to be that man.

An Address to the People of Great Britain on the Doctrine of Libels and the Office of Juror is a pamphlet of 120 pages occasioned by the various prosecutions of radicals by the government for public libel but specifically by the charges brought against Gilbert Wakefield and his publisher

¹ The comedy was written by George Ruggles to ridicule the pedantic and barbarous cant of lawyers and was acted for the first time at Cambridge in 1614. Dyer wrote the prologue for delivery at its presentation at Westminster School in 1794.

² xx, 472 (August 1796).

Johnson in 1799. Its publication, however, was delayed by Dyer's usual lack of promptness until after Wakefield's conviction and so did him no good. While, according to the title, it purports to deal with doctrines of law, its first concern is the persecution of opinion which the government was then carrying on. The most impassioned part is his appeal for a free press. It took courage to write this in 1799:

Some who admit that thought is free are backward to allow that man should be free to publish his thoughts. But who are the men who propagate this doctrine? . . . They are selfish and narrow divines, artful politicians, corrupt lawyers . . . Shackle opinion, restrain the press—and what will you effect? You will give confidence to absurdity and degrade wisdom. The principle goes to throw such philosophers as Bacon and Locke into shade; to silence such moralists as Helvetius, Hume, and Rousseau, it would encourage babes to prattle and triflers to dogmatize.¹

But public opinion was by this time too much inflamed against the radicals for many to listen to reason in their defence. Even the *Monthly Review*² was seized with concern, criticizing him for choosing the radical philosophers as the moralists to whom mankind is most indebted, especially 'at this time and in this country', though it recommended the *Address* as 'good reading'. But the *Gentleman's Magazine* in its hostility threw amenities to the winds in this vicious and supercilious thrust:

As friends to this bold and disappointed writer, we see with concern that he is but too well versed in the *theory*, if not the *practice*, of libels . . . To allow men to say what they please of each other . . . must finally lead to their doing what they please to each other . . . No *honest* man in this country and in these times would wish to set himself as a rival of Voltaire and a propagator of opinions whose influence has been so severely felt.³

The two volumes of *Poems*, published in 1802 and including four critical essays, are of a very miscellaneous character in both versification and subject-matter. There are lyrics, elegies, odes, occasional poems, anacreontics, and pieces of a philosophical cast. Some of them show a lively fancy, but it does not always free itself from the trammels of mere learning. His poetry here is more rarely made the vehicle of his liberal sympathies than in the former volumes. 'On Visiting the Tomb of David Hume' is one of his many tributes of deep respect to the great sceptic:

...sagacious moralist,
Whose lessons shine not only in thy works,
Thy life was moral; and may I condemn
The man of searching mind, who systems weighed
In judgment's nicer scale, and yielded not
His weight of faith, when he durst not believe.

'The Padlocked Lady', a long poem of thirty-three pages, is written in a happy vein for our poet, but signally fails to affect the reader at the

¹ Pp. 114–15.

³ LXIX, Part 1, 320 (April 1799).

² XXIX, 87 (May 1799).

emotional climax. It treats of the restraints put on British liberty during the war with France. The author represents himself as pursuing Freedom through the world under the conventional image of a fair woman, only at last to find her with her eyes bound by a golden bandage, her ears stopped to human cries,

While from her lips, to seal her tongue,
A vile, inglorious padlock hung.

The spirit of the larger patriotism is also breathed through the banalities of 'The Citizen of the World'.

By the beginning of the century it appears that practically all of Dyer's ideas which connect him with the revolutionary tradition had been written out. He seems at this time to have entered upon that long era of 'calm and sinless peace' about which Lamb writes and during which most of his time was given to various scholarly endeavours, to laborious but generally unimportant projects for the booksellers, to the amenities of a bibliophile, and to the social claims of Lamb's famous literary fraternity. In fact, the ineffectiveness of reform propaganda was so conclusively shown during the early years of the century that few even of the most radical writers persisted.

In 1812 he published his *Four Letters on the English Constitution*, the last production of consequence as an expression of his political philosophy. In this book he reviews, without abating a jot of his earlier convictions, his previously expressed opinions about the principle of divine right, the sovereignty of the people, the unrepresentative status of bishops in the House of Lords, the priority of the constitution to the establishment, the defects in representation, the evils of the Corporation and Test Acts, and the fundamental simplicity of good government. He commends the suppressed reform societies for their promotion of enlarged views of the representative system and their fight for the liberty of the press. Believing with Godwin that only arbitrary government can give permanence to error, Dyer is confident that with the establishment of an impartial administration of justice these societies will be restored to their former influence. He still does not hesitate to align himself openly with revolutionary political thinkers in some matters. For example, he accepts with little modification Paine's definition of a constitution as 'a thing antecedent to government and laws', though he thinks Paine goes to ridiculous lengths in denying the existence of the English constitution altogether. But this is pure Paine:

Those principles which ought to govern societies of men are deducible only from our wants, and appeal to *that divine light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world*, the primitive reason: they are not difficult to ascertain nor difficult to be understood.

He writes with his old indignation of the *Reflections*, whose author pleaded 'for power against liberty, for the usurpations of establishments against the laws of nature'.¹

But for all the unadulterated radicalism of many of his ideas, George Dyer was generally very careful not to flout the English government on immediate questions of policy. The shades of speculation were more inviting to him than the platform of propaganda. Though he was intellectually hospitable toward the radical agitators, he shrank from much active participation in reform. He preferred, like Godwin, to manufacture the intellectual artillery for the radicals rather than to command a battery.

This outward caution meets us very frequently in the *Inquiry*. He does not openly advocate immediate disestablishment; in fact, he sometimes admits the expediency of an establishment. He is wary in letting his readers know just where he parts company with his intemperate friend Wakefield:

Mr Wakefield's sentiments on the office of the civil magistrate and on the tendency of religious establishments are, I am persuaded, the same as mine; nor do I here mean to drop any reflections on the present ruling powers.²

He is careful not to charge the government with the disorders against dissenters at Birmingham in 1791; but he writes that he is 'far from thinking they were not prompted by men who supposed themselves complying with the wishes of government'.³ At the conclusion of his discussion of the constitutional objections against subscription, he declares: 'I am no political reformer, but an inquirer after truth.' He disclaims any resentment against 'the persons of our governors'. He makes the admission, without being driven to it, that he has 'to take shame that the hand that now writes against subscription has yet subscribed itself'.

In his other writings his circumspection can be clearly traced. Sometimes his outward discretion is in amusing contrast with his inner convictions. In a passage on titles from a communication on the peculiarities of Quakers to the *Monthly Magazine*, there is a studied and almost ludicrous effort to tread the narrow path between offence to the government and faithfulness to his own convictions:

Blackstone's comparison of a particular *form of government* to a pyramid with a broad strong base and terminating at length in a point, has been much admired. It is elegant but it is sophistical, though the excellency of his form of government I neither

¹ Pp. 121, 115. The quotations are taken from the third edition with additions, 1817.

² Preface of the *Inquiry*, p. xx.

³ P. 288. The house of Joseph Priestley with the most valuable laboratory in England was burned in these riots.

affirm nor deny. The same comparison has been applied to *titles*, where the sophism is still more transparent. The proper way to expose it in both cases is to appeal to nations the most enlightened, to societies the best regulated, to families the most orderly and harmonious: to inquire into the origin of titles and to trace their effects. Of the French I say nothing.¹

In the *Address on Labels*, he is fearful lest he be thought in his defence of Wakefield 'to arraign courts of justice' when his aim is 'to interest the friend to humanity'. Here also he tells us that, while he approves the purposes of the Constitutional Society, he 'never had the honour of belonging to it'. To escape the imputation of being a political undesirable, it appears that he was sometimes willing to thin his political philosophy down to the mildest kind of liberalism, as the following passage from a letter to Rickman in 1801 shows:

How dare you call me a railer at Governments! My opinion is, I think, both modest and *generous*, viz.: that some govern too much, and too much government, sooner or later, defeats its own purposes and brings on troubles. Rulers therefore . . . should understand that if their interest and the interest of the people are not the same, they are, so far, not standing on good and solid ground.²

The growth of his caution during the revolutionary decade is shown in the abridged version of the 'Ode on Liberty' included in the *Poems* of 1802. The glowing passages on Paine and seven other contemporary radicals are omitted, while the tributes to Locke, Milton and Algernon Sidney are retained. In the later version a prayer of the version of 1792 to Liberty to aid the counsels and fight the battles of France is made to refer to England: but the tribute to the Polish patriots under Kosciusko remains. At least, his radicalism was becoming more English and less French. He was, by 1802, learning to moderate it more into conformity with the necessities of a prudential world. In 'To an Enthusiast',³ he asks:

What avail, O man, fantastic flights?
Why muse ideal deeds,
Heedless of what is true?

George Dyer did not stand at Armageddon and battle for the radicalism of the revolutionary era, but in his writings he did hold aloft its banner in days when its adherents were without honour in their own country. The residuum of his radicalism, after the tests to which reaction against the French Revolution exposed it, comprised much more than the mere benevolence with which his name has been so exclusively associated. He deserves an honourable place in the traditions of English liberty.

M. RAY ADAMS.

LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA.

¹ VI, 342 (November 1798).

² Orlo Williams, *Life and Letters of John Rickman*, p. 59.

³ *Poems*, 1802, I, 12.

THE CRITICISM OF JACQUES RIVIÈRE

I

WHEN Jacques Rivière died of typhoid fever in 1925 at the age of thirty-nine, European literature was deprived of one of the outstanding minds of our age. At the time of his death, Rivière was known to English readers as the distinguished editor of the *Nouvelle Revue Française* and as the author of a number of remarkable critical studies which had appeared in its pages; but the bulk of his work was not published in book form until after his death, and it may be doubted whether it has had the attention that it deserves in this country. Rivière was one of the most characteristic representatives of contemporary French spiritual and intellectual life, and it is difficult to think of any other modern writer who can contribute more to the understanding of the French mind or explain more clearly the immense importance of the French contribution to civilization.

Rivière's field was a wide one. It included religion and the novel as well as political and literary criticism. Since his death, Rivière has become a cult in certain circles in France. Pious hands have unearthed and published fragments of theological speculation, a great number of letters and an unfinished novel. All his work bears the impress of a distinguished mind, but it is probable that his literary criticism will be regarded as his most lasting achievement. It must be a cause for regret that the critic has been completely overshadowed by the theologian and we may doubt whether Rivière's criticism has been fully appreciated on the continent any more than in this country. 'Rivière', writes a Belgian author, 'would never have claimed to be regarded as a literary critic.'¹ Whether he would have claimed to be regarded as a literary critic or not, he seems to me to have been one of the most distinguished of all modern French critics, and he was at his best a far better critic than Remy de Gourmont, though he has never enjoyed the same influence as that writer. The fact that some of his finest essays he buried in the files of the *Nouvelle Revue Française*, where they first appeared, and are not readily accessible to the public must serve as an excuse for an exposé of his work.

This may not appear altogether the place to discuss Rivière's theological opinions, and it may seem unnecessary in view of the wide publicity that they have already received; but it must be pointed out

¹ *La pensée de Jacques Rivière*, par Adrien Jans, Brussels, 1938, p. 71.

that his contribution to criticism is only fully intelligible when we know something of his religious development and of his life.¹

Rivière was the son of a Professor of Medicine at the University of Bordeaux, and he was brought up in an atmosphere of rigid, unadventurous middle-class piety. He seems to have reacted against it while still a schoolboy; but though faith was surrendered almost unconsciously, he was careful to conceal his defection from his family. The voluminous correspondence with Alain-Fournier²—author of *Le Grand Meaulnes*—whom he met at the Lycée Lakanal, gives an attractive picture of Rivière during his student days. He was sympathetic and intelligent and his interests were mainly literary. He was more mature than most English boys of the same age, but there is little in the correspondence or his early essays to show that he was developing into a writer of outstanding ability.

The crisis came with the discovery of Claudel's *Tête d'or*, and an enthusiastic passage in an early study shows how deeply Rivière had been impressed.

Qu'on ne pense pas pouvoir lui consacrer une froide admiration [he wrote of Claudel]! Ce n'est pas l'assentiment de notre goût qu'il désire; mais il exige notre âme, afin de l'offrir à Dieu; il veut forcer notre consentement intime; il veut nous arracher, malgré nous, à l'abjection du doute et du dilettantisme.³

Claudel's reputation as a poet is difficult for some of us to understand, but there is no doubt that he played a decisive part in Rivière's development, nor can it fairly be denied that his influence was in the long run a beneficial one. It was beneficial not because he convinced Rivière, but because Claudel provided exactly the right sort of opposition to Rivière's own extravagances.

Mais pourquoi la vérité, l'unique vérité [we find him writing to Claudel]? Pourquoi celle-là et pas les autres? Pourquoi pas d'innombrables vérités, auxquelles tour à tour nous donnerions toute notre passion? Pourquoi refuser mon âme à tant de beautés autres? Voilà Gide maintenant qui transparait et vous voyez bien combien par ses livres je suis infesté.⁴

Gide has declared roundly that Rivière was never one of his disciples, and Claudel has made it clear in his Preface to *A la trace de Dieu* that he was far from sharing all Rivière's theological and philosophical views; but there can be no doubt that the antithesis Gide—Claudel stood for something real in Rivière's mind and that it was largely responsible for the standpoint that he adopted in his later writings.

¹ I have discussed this more fully in an article called 'The Problem of Jacques Rivière' in *The Dublin Review* for October 1936.

² *J. Rivière et Alain-Fournier: Correspondance, 1905-1914*, 4 vols., Paris, 1926-8.

³ *Études*, Paris, 1912, p. 119.

⁴ *J. Rivière et Paul Claudel: Correspondance, 1907-1914*, Paris, 1926, pp. 37-8.

Claudél represented the austere Thomism of the twentieth century and Gide, in spite of his professed classicism, an unbridled individualism—a belief that the human being has the right to exploit his own personality without any form of moral restraint in the hunt for novel experiences. Rivière's dilemma is well expressed in two passages—one from *Études* and the other from *De la Foi*—both written within a few years of one another.

Refuser le christianisme de Claudél, c'est se condamner à n'avoir plus de recours qu'en le néant.¹

Non pas une objection, non pas un embarras de ma raison, non pas un doute [he wrote of his hesitation to return to the Faith]; mais l'impossibilité de souhaiter être différent.²

In other words, Rivière's was the familiar difficulty not merely of reconciling the fullness of life with the acceptance of dogmatic religion, but of perceiving that dogma is the condition which enables the Christian to have life and have it more abundantly. His apologetic is in no sense an attempt to convince the unbeliever; it is an attempt to resolve a psychological problem or, as he himself puts it, a 'confrontation' of religion and the modern mind.

Il faut vouloir la vérité d'abord, quelle qu'elle puisse être [runs the opening sentence of *A la trace de Dieu*]. Dieu ne nous intéresse que s'il existe. S'il n'existe pas à quoi nous servira de l'avoir démontré? Mais s'il existe qu'importe que nous n'ayons pas pu le démontrer.³

In the chapter of that fascinating essay, *De la Foi*, called 'Des "Raisons de Croire"', he remarks:

Non pas celles que proposait Pascal et qu'il voulait universelles, propres à convaincre toute intelligence. Sous ce titre, je ne prétends décrire que les mouvements tout personnels de ma pensée.⁴

Il n'y a de véritable science, il n'y a de connaissance certaine [he writes in another place] que si une expérience y correspond. La métaphysique ne porte sur aucune expérience: donc elle est vaine. Mais il y a une expérience religieuse; les dogmes catholiques sont vérifiables par l'expérience, bien qu'en un tout autre sens que les lois de la chimie par exemple.⁵

Que les façons de raisonner se fanent encore plus vite que les façons de sentir. Que peut-on rêver qui nous soit plus étranger que la dialectique toute verbale de Platon, ou même que les raisonnements de Saint Augustin sur la mémoire? Et même dans le raisonnement scolastique, il y a quelque chose qui ne va plus. Même dans celui de Descartes. N'est-ce pas dire que la raison *toute seule* n'est pas avec la vérité transcendente dans un rapport constant? Nous la retournons dans tous les sens. Elle s'use tour à tour sous chacune de ses formes pures. Il n'y a que lorsqu'elle est encadrée d'intuitions, 'attelée', que ses démonstrations prennent de la constance, de la perpétuité.⁶

Rivière's approach was essentially that of the pragmatist; but if it would hardly satisfy the theologian, it is not difficult to see why it appealed to the audience for whom it was intended. Whatever its short-

¹ *Études*, p. 119.

³ *A la trace de Dieu*, Paris, 1926, p. 27.

⁵ *A la trace de Dieu*, pp. 190-1.

² *De la Foi*, Paris, 1927, p. 92.

⁴ *De la Foi*, p. 36.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 173-4.

comings, it provided an antidote to facile modern apologetic. It is not unfair to say that Claudel has always been too much of a theologian to be an artist and that Rivière was too much of an artist to be a theologian. Yet it was precisely the sensitiveness, the insight of the literary critic which prevented him from being taken in by the religious publicist. In a letter to Gide he wrote:

Comme vous j'ai horreur de tout ce qui est apologétique, de tout ce qui est argumentation, machinisme, construction de preuves, etc.... J'ai horreur de Chesterton entre autres raisons parce que c'est un monsieur qui démontre. Il relève ses manches, il prépare son petit attirail, et le voilà parti pour prouver que le Christianisme est le vrai.... Là où l'on voit bien la laideur de Chesterton, c'est dans la qualité polémique de ses images; elles sont choisies non pas pour peindre, mais pour convaincre; ce sont des compères qu'il met dans la salle des conférences. Elles sont grosses et frappantes comme des projections électriques. Elles sont destinées à faire passer un murmure dans l'assemblée... Il y a un souci de cacher les défauts de l'argumentation, de la couvrir là où elle est fautive qui est exactement le contraire de celui que j'ai fait paraître, parce que je n'ai voulu parler que là où j'avais quelque chose à dire. Chesterton comble avec de la déduction tous les endroits où la vérité se retire, voulant impressionner ainsi par la masse et la conséquence de sa machine. Moi, je n'ai parlé que là où j'apercevais de l'immense océan de l'incertitude émerger quelque vérité.¹

As the comment of a mature mind on the methods of Chesterton this seems to me to be final and unanswerable. It is final and unanswerable because the literary critic has refused to allow the content of the work to blind him to the inherent falsity of the approach. It is here that Rivière had the advantage over Claudel whose admiration for Chesterton was well known. Claudel is extremely effective when dealing with a second-rate anti-clerical like Souday, but criticism like Rivière's of a man whose faith he shares has always lain tantalizingly outside his reach.

Although Rivière returned to the Church in 1912 the tension between dogma and experience was not resolved; it was not a transitional stage, but a final state which became the dominating factor in all his criticism. His distrust of metaphysics and his insistence on intuition, which account for the weakness of his theological writings, were a considerable asset in his criticism. For the critic is necessarily a pragmatist; he must realize that whatever his personal beliefs, in literature no order can ever be the final order and its vitality and life depend on perpetual change. It was because Rivière saw this with such clarity that he was saved from the particular snares that lie in wait for the French critic.

II

'His critical works', wrote Mr T. S. Eliot in the special number of the *Nouvelle Revue Française* devoted to Rivière's memory, 'combine a precision which is free from rigidity with intellectual suppleness and

¹ *La Nouvelle Revue Française*, April 1925, pp. 773, 774, 775.

finesse. For a mind like mine, which is too prone to measure everything by rules derived from a dogmatic conception of literature, which tends more and more to become rigid and formalist, the critical method practised by Rivière is an excellent discipline.'

This is a good description of Rivière's peculiar virtues. There is one striking difference between English and French criticism. In France a training in technical philosophy still forms part of the normal secondary school curriculum, and the result is that nearly all the distinguished French critics of the last century tried to create 'systems' even when they repudiated the term. A training in philosophy ought to be a help to the critic, but in France this has not always been so. It encourages the Frenchman's natural tendency to abstract speculation, is a perpetual invitation to the logical mind to build up an order in which comprehensiveness is sacrificed to external coherence. Instead of improving the standard of practical criticism, it often carries the critic farther and farther away from his texts which become no more than a pretext for the discussion of abstract problems which are only indirectly connected with them. With a critic like Taine, for example, literature is so much the handmaid of a dogmatic conception of life that it degenerates into a minor branch of sociology or history.

Rivière's knowledge of philosophy stood him in good stead. It enabled him to appreciate to the full the implications of the writer whom he was discussing, but his philosophical scepticism prevented him from overlooking the merits of his author because they happened to be at variance with some private system. No one had a deeper sense of the need of a clearly defined philosophy of life, but no one had a deeper distrust of the neat formula, the facile solution. It is this honesty and integrity, this sensitive response to his texts, which gives Rivière's criticism its balance and which relates him to Baudelaire and Bourget and distinguishes him from Sainte-Beuve and Taine.

Au XVII^e siècle [he wrote] si l'idée était venue à quelqu'un de demander à Molière ou à Racine pourquoi ils écrivaient, ils n'eussent sans doute pas pu trouver d'autre réponse que: 'Pour distraire les honnêtes gens'. C'est avec le romantisme seulement que l'acte littéraire a commencé à être conçu comme une sorte de tentative sur l'absolu, et son résultat comme une révélation; la littérature a recueilli à ce moment l'héritage de la religion et s'est organisée sur le modèle de ce qu'elle remplaçait; l'écrivain est devenu prêtre; tous ses gestes n'ont plus tendu qu'à amener dans cette hostie qu'était l'œuvre, la présence réelle. Tout la littérature du XIX^e siècle est une vaste incantation dirigée vers le miracle.¹

When we remember Arnold's dictum:

More and more mankind will discover that we have to turn to poetry to interpret life for us, to console us, to sustain us. Without poetry our science will appear in-

¹ *N.R.F.*, February 1924, p. 161.

complete; and most of what now passes for religion and philosophy will be replaced by poetry.

—the importance of Rivière's approach is apparent. It is one of the signs of Rivière's vitality that most of his best work was written in the course of controversies about the main literary problems of the time, and this led him to state his case in an extreme form. With this reservation, however, his paper on 'La Crise du Concept de Littérature' is an admirable presentation of the Christian and classicist attitude towards literature. It is rooted in the belief that all human activities are good, but it refuses to admit that one activity can ever be a substitute for another, and any attempt to make it so is a misunderstanding of man's nature which leads to confusion and disillusionment. Although Rivière was a classicist, his classicism was not a system; it had nothing in common with Brunetière's. It was based on a deeply felt awareness of the continuity of the French tradition, and one of his most interesting and provocative feats was to point out that Proust belonged to the main French tradition and was in the direct line of succession from Racine. The whole of his criticism was rooted in his sense of the great classic writers as a living force, and this makes his attack on the Romantics lucid and deadly. What he admired in Racine was that master's power of translating his perceptions directly into words without allowing his immediate experience to be distorted by preconceived ideas, and what he disliked in Rousseau—whose literary ability he fully admitted—was the way in which the *données* were modified and distorted until literature became a substitute for religion or a branch of moral philosophy.

Perhaps Rivière's most original work was his study of Racine. The short lecture on *Andromaque* in *Moralisme et littérature* does more than almost any other piece of modern criticism to demolish the 'tender' Racine of the nineteenth-century myth and to restore the true Racine whose ferocity shocked his own age as it delights ours. The distinguished critics of the nineteenth century were inclined to insist too much on Racine's elegance and to overlook the destructive force of passion in his work and the extraordinary insight into human emotions which Sainte-Beuve referred to vaguely as his 'savante métaphysique du cœur' in the *Portraits littéraires*.

Il n'y a donc rien dans cette âme [he said of a character in *Andromaque*], qui fasse digne, à proprement parler, contre la vague de l'amour, sinon une vague contraire, qu'il appellera courroux, dépit, haine, tout ce que vous voudrez, mais qui sera dans son fond... de même nature, de même étoffe que la passion qu'elle combattrà, qui ne sera dans son fond que le reflux de cette même passion, tournée contre elle-même.¹

¹ *Moralisme et littérature*, Paris, 1932, p. 28.

Commenting on the line:

Leur haine ne fera qu'irriter sa tendresse

Rivière goes on to say:

La psychologie de Racine y est formulée dans son principe et même dans son postulat avec une netteté absolue: il montre ce que je voudrais appeler le contact direct ou pur des sentiments entre eux et leur façon de se modifier immédiatement les uns les autres. Nulle intervention de la réflexion, de la raison. . . Non, il (Pylade) prévoit, il sait que cette haine ira directement irriter sa tendresse pour Andromaque; rien ne pourra empêcher le frottement. Il y a dans les sentiments tels que les décrit Racine, un manque de gaine, si j'ose dire, qui les rend sans cesse nus les uns pour les autres. Ils s'influencent comme des corps chimiques qui seraient toujours à l'état libre. Sitôt que la haine des Grecs sera manifestée par la bouche d'Oreste, l'amour de Pyrrhus pour Andromaque sera attaqué comme par un acide: son épiderme sera irrité. La rancœur, l'esprit de résistance et de vengeance surgiront à sa suite immédiatement dans l'âme du héros. Il y aura inflammation directe et foudroyante.

Quand j'ai amené tout à l'heure le mot: *dissolu*, je lui donnais mentalement tout son sens, y compris celui qu'il tient de l'étymologie. Je voulais dire: les sentiments sont peints par Racine sans rien qui les attache; le bloc de l'âme où ils sont pris est comme délitée, tout ce qui fait ciment ou mastic entre eux, tout ce qui les *compose* est supprimé.¹

Il faut aller plus loin encore [he writes a page or two later]: il faut montrer à l'œuvre chez les personnages de Racine ces ferments de dissolution, ces forces destructrices de la personnalité que l'on reproche aux écrivains français modernes d'analyser trop complaisamment dans leurs œuvres. Presque tous les personnages de Racine, du moins tous ceux auxquels le poète réussit à nous intéresser, sont des personnages qui se défont.²

Finally, he concludes:

Je prétends que l'indifférence de Racine à la morale lui a permis, et pouvait seule lui permettre, de saisir l'âme dans sa plus obscure mais dans sa plus réelle spontanéité. Ce qu'il est arrivé à déblayer d'adventice, à noter d'immédiat dans le cœur humain est proprement miraculeux.³

This is not a plea for a shallow amorism in literature. Rivière believed that the claim of truth was paramount and in his study of Racine he anticipates the theory of the *sainteté de la vérité* which has since become familiar in the work of Catholic writers like M. Maritain. It is possible that his thesis carried him too far in the last passage. He seems to me to confuse the moral attitude of Racine's *characters* with the attitude of the *author* towards them. Racine's greatness does not lie least in the fact that he was the critic of an age of false stability and, though there was undoubtedly an element of complicity in his representation of the moral collapse of his characters, it is going too far to assume that he wholly approved of the moral tone of the world that he depicted. Rivière's contention that he did not interfere with his characters by introducing irrelevant moral considerations is, however, perfectly sound and this distinction made possible the searching criticism of Rousseau and the Romantic novel in the same work.

¹ *Moralisme et littérature*, pp. 31-2.

² *Ibid.*, p. 38.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 35-6.

Autrement dit, Rousseau ne vient pas nous parler de ses amours ou de ses haines, de ses plaisirs ou de ses ennuis, mais de sa magnanimité et de sa bassesse. 'Je me suis montré tel que je suis; méprisable et vil, quand je l'ai été, bon, généreux, sublime, quand je l'ai été' Il instaure, il inaugure par là une certaine manière de n'apercevoir les sentiments que qualifiés, de n'apercevoir que des qualifications au lieu de sentiments, qui ne paraît des plus dangereuses.

En quoi dangereuse?—En ceci que sous les mots de méprisable ou de généreux, de sincère ou de menteur, vous n'apercevez plus rien de précis: la spécificité du sentiment, sa forme, son geste, tels que nous les admirons tout à l'heure traduits par Racine, disparaissent. Il y a quelque chose de vague, d'infini, qui s'introduit dans l'âme à la faveur des évaluations, quelles qu'elles soient, qu'on porte sur elle.

Je ne veux pas dire que Rousseau ne réussit à nous donner aucune idée de son personnage; nous l'apercevons au contraire avec un relief merveilleux; mais il garde quelque chose de mat, d'opaque, de 'couvert' au sens où l'on emploie ce mot pour le temps¹

When we come to Romantic fiction we find that 'the feelings have disappeared and only the qualifications remain', that the characters are inclined to be illustrations of the authors' own private beliefs:

Toute la fiction romantique est gâtée par une certaine préconception morale. Chateaubriand, Victor Hugo, Musset, Vigny et Balzac même, dans une certaine mesure, Balzac tellement plus grand et pour qui mon admiration, vous le pensez bien, est immense, ce sont des individus qu'ils essaient de camper devant nous; ils ont trouvé ce jeu nouveau, ce jeu facile: des êtres qui ne ressemblent à aucun autre, des êtres aux gestes immenses et gratuits.

Mais d'où naissent-ils, ces êtres? D'une certaine image morale: pureté, grandeur, innocence, noblesse sublime, ou au contraire: infamie, perfidie sans fond, bassesse insigne, perversité sans mélange; ou encore: tristesse, dégoût de vivre, dédain magnifique, sombre désintéressement: voilà ce que leurs auteurs ont devant les yeux avant même qu'ils ne les dessinent, voilà le schème d'où ils les font sortir.²

Voici ce que je veux dire. la façon romantique d'imaginer les qualités d'un personnage avant le personnage lui-même, ou plutôt de faire sortir un personnage de certaines qualités, abstraites et pures, même hors de la psychologie, entraîne automatiquement vers la poésie absolue. Plus généralement encore Rousseau conduit à Rimbaud. Dès que la valeur s'introduit en psychologie, on a des monstres; et dès qu'on a des monstres, on quitte la vie.³

In order to discover the reasons for Racine's insight into human feelings, we must turn to the magnificent essay called 'Reconnaissance à Dada':

Tous les classiques étaient implicitement positivistes: ils acceptaient le fait d'un monde, aussi bien intérieur qu'extérieur, et l'obligation de l'apprendre. Peu leur importait le degré de sa réalité, et s'il était par hasard une simple fulguration de leur moi. Ils recevaient en toute simplicité sa borne.⁴

Nous répugnons toujours [he said of French writers] en traçant le portrait d'un personnage, à y rien laisser d'indéfini: 'Il y avait du je ne sais quoi dans tout Monsieur de la Rochefoucauld' écrit le Cardinal de Retz. — Oui, mais justement il l'exprime pour que le lecteur n'ait pas à l'y sentir.

Jamais rien, dans le personnage suscité ne reste béant par où des inspirations imprévues pourraient lui venir. Quand nous le faisons parler, jamais rien ne résonne inexplicablement, jamais rien ne fait entendre un son différent pour l'esprit et pour l'imagination. Dans tous les interstices de son caractère nous pénétrons avec notre cire industrielle, et nous les cimentons. Une parfaite obturation de ses abîmes: tel est l'idéal auquel nous tendons. Et j' imagine que c'est cela qui doit gêner les étrangers

¹ *Moralisme et littérature*, pp. 50-1.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 77-8.

² *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁴ *N.R.F.*, August 1920, p. 226.

devant les Nérone de Racine, ou même devant le Julien de Stendhal. Nous ne donnons jamais le vertige de l'âme humaine.

Plutôt que d'égarer l'esprit vers un infini psychologique, on peut très bien concevoir que la tâche du romancier soit de le ramener, par la seule continuité de ses peintures, vers cet événement secret, mais concret et commensurable.¹

This is one of the best and most lucid definitions of French *clarté* in existence. Rivière shows that the belief in the existence of a clearly defined external world leads to the belief in a clearly *definable* inner world. The acceptance of the limit imposed by the external world imposes a limit on the extent to which the investigation of the inner world can be pushed; but the discipline is a positive one and contributes to the order and clarity of the great French masters. It makes possible a profound analysis of human emotion without any danger of vagueness. Thus the characters of Racine and Stendhal are logical and coherent wholes; there is none of the confusion, none of the misty *élans* that we find in English or German fiction.

The conclusions that follow from this criticism are clear. It will be generally agreed that modern literature has been profoundly altered by the discredit into which the classical metaphysic has fallen and the rise of philosophical idealism. The result of this change of outlook has been the writer's loss of faith in the existence of an external world and a retreat into the world within. This change has also been accompanied by a profound moral disturbance (which in literature goes back to Rousseau), and traditional morality has been replaced by the private systems on which, as Rivière shows, the Romantics based their work.

The influence of these changes on nineteenth-century literature and language has been described by Rivière in the essay, 'Reconnaissance à Dada':

Il faudra tâcher un jour de décrire en détail, et avec illustrations à l'appui, la lente modification qui s'est produite au cours du XIX^e siècle dans l'attitude mentale de l'écrivain. En gros, elle a consisté dans un progressif affaiblissement de l'instinct objectif, dans une foi de plus en plus grêle à l'importance des modèles extérieurs, dans un détachement croissant de la réalité, et, conjointement, dans une identification de plus en plus étroite du sujet avec lui-même, dans un effort de sa part pour recueillir à l'état pur sa propre efficace, pour épouser son propre jaillissement et pour faire de l'œuvre d'art la simple incarnation de ses vellétés et de ses rêves.

On pourrait dire qu'à partir du Romantisme l'écrivain sent sa puissance prendre le pas sur sa perception... la création et la création immédiate, continue, devient pour lui le seul secours, le seul devoir.²

This view is explained in another paper on 'Marcel Proust et la Tradition Classique':

A partir de Stendhal, il se produit une dégradation continue à notre faculté, pourtant si ancienne, si invétérée, de comprendre et de traduire le sentiment. Flaubert représente le moment où le mal devient sensible et alarmant. Je ne veux pas dire que

¹ *N.R.F.*, February 1922, pp. 176-8.

² *N.R.F.*, August 1920, p. 225.

Madame Bovary et *L'Éducation sentimentale* n'impliquent aucune connaissance du cœur humain; mais ni l'un ni l'autre ouvrage ne contient la moindre vue *directe* sur sa complexité; ni l'un ni l'autre ne nous fait avancer en lui, ne nous en découvre *de face* de nouveaux aspects. Il y a chez l'auteur une certaine pesanteur de l'intelligence au regard de la sensibilité; elle la suit mal; elle ne la débrouille plus; elle ne sait plus l'attendre dans son caprice et dans sa nuance.¹

This criticism of Flaubert was developed in a still more radical fashion in the later paper:

Flaubert est bien curieux qui, tout en se donnant l'air de peindre et de reproduire trait pour trait la plus plate, la plus inerte, et donc la plus extérieure réalité, au fond ne fait que poursuivre au travers d'elle les fantômes informes qui ont pris possession de son imagination. Jamais on ne vit réaliste plus sceptique sur l'existence des choses qu'il s'applique à décrire, plus indifférent dans le fond, à leur structure véritable. À aucun moment leur complexité intrinsèque ne l'attire; il est étonnamment dépourvu du besoin de la débrouiller; il n'y a point pour lui de problème, ni de tentation; la nature est pour lui aussi peu sirène, aussi peu *Lorelei* qu'on puisse le rêver. La soumission qu'il lui déclare ne s'accompagne en lui et n'est l'effet d'aucun véritable amour. L'observation ne lui sert nullement à l'explorer, à l'approfondir, à gagner ses régions intimes. Rien de moins entrant que son regard. Il ne voit rien et ne cherche à rien voir au-delà de ce dont il a besoin. . . . De la pierre, de la planche, de l'ardoise ou des tuiles: voilà tout ce que l'observation est chargée de lui obtenir, voilà la seule utilité qu'il lui connaisse.²

The same paper contains a comment on the language of Mallarmé which is of great interest:

C'est avec Mallarmé, c'est chez Rimbaud (on pourrait même remonter plus haut et sur ce point Flaubert n'est pas sans responsabilité) que les mots ont commencé à se débaucher. Et sans doute je tiens pour une très géniale et très importante découverte celle de cette vertu secrète en eux, distincte de celle qu'ils ont de signifier, et qui leur permet d'absorber un peu de la sensibilité de l'écrivain et de l'emmener, à l'état de simple semence, dans un autre monde où elle refleurira. Nul plus que moi n'admire la façon dont chez Mallarmé ils se dégagent tout doucement de leur sens individuel, puis de leur solidarité logique, pour simplement finir, s'étant rejoints ailleurs, par éclore, par naître à plusieurs. Mais enfin, dans cette acception, ils cessent d'être des signes; la valeur qu'ils reçoivent est d'un ordre post-intellectuel. Ce qui détermine leur apparition, c'est désormais uniquement leur parenté intérieure avec tel ou tel aspect du sujet. Ils ne viennent plus que sous son injonction, que sous sa poussée, et pour lui composer une figure nouvelle étrangère. Le danger est immense. Car la ressemblance de l'un ou de l'autre avec le sujet ne pouvant être appréciée que par celui-ci, rien n'empêche qu'elle soit reconnue dans tous les cas. Tout mot, du moment qu'il est proféré, ou seulement envisagé par l'esprit en un éclair, a une relation avec lui. Tout mot, puisqu'il est venu à la pensée, l'exprime, car rien d'autre ne peut l'y avoir amené, que son aptitude précisément, même si elle reste incompréhensible, à l'exprimer. Tout mot donc est justifiable, est expressif, arrivant après n'importe quel autre, présenté sous n'importe quel jour, révélant n'importe quoi.³

This is an extreme statement of the case against Flaubert and it has not been allowed to pass unchallenged; but though the criticism may seem unduly severe it was surely correct as a diagnosis of the tendencies at work in Flaubert's novels. The aim of the essay was to show that Romanticism leads logically to Surréalisme and that the work of both

¹ *N.R.F.*, February 1920, p. 194.

² *N.R.F.*, August 1920, pp. 225-6.

³ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 233-4

Flaubert and Rimbaud represented stages of the same process. When the study is looked at as a whole there can be little doubt that Rivière proved his thesis up to the hilt.

The criticism of Rimbaud appears the more surprising when we remember the claims made for him in Rivière's book which is probably the finest and most sustained piece of criticism that he wrote.¹ As a young man, Rivière admired Rimbaud because his poetry was designed to shock us out of our conventional attitudes and our complacent acceptance of everyday reality. His work was a perfect illustration of the belief that in literature no order can ever be the final order. He appeared to Rivière to have discovered a new and legitimate region of experience which lay beyond the horizon of the great classics and had nothing in common with the misty *élans* of the Romantics. He was a liberator who offered a possibility of escape from the impasse towards which literature seemed to be drifting. As he grew older, however, Rivière became more conscious of the dangers of Rimbaud's experiments and this is apparent in his later criticism. He considered that the *clarté* of the French tradition was beginning to disappear and that the characters not only of dramatists and novelists, but also the personality revealed in *Une saison en enfer*, were turning into inhuman 'monsters' and that literature was drawing farther and farther away from our ordinary lives. The experiments with language that we find in Rimbaud and Mallarmé led to the discovery of new and subtle combinations of feelings, but only at the sacrifice of the discipline and order of the great tradition. Although Rivière declared in 'Reconnaissance à Dada' that there were times when he thought that Rimbaud was the greatest poet who had ever lived, he had come to think that the price paid for the new discoveries was too high. Experiment led to extreme subjectivism, to a confusion of feeling which in time would involve the disappearance of all poetry and all literature.

For Rivière literature seemed to be faced with two main dangers. One was Naturalism—the slavish copying of material reality—which was the degenerate offspring of Classicism and which could only lead to bankruptcy. The other was a further development along the road towards Surréalisme which led no less surely to disaster. Rivière always laid great stress on the gifts of the seventeenth-century masters and he made no secret of his belief that Romanticism was a perversion of the French

¹ *Rimbaud*, Paris, 1930. It should be noticed that this study was first published in the *N.R.F.* in 1914 and did not appear in book form until sixteen years later. It is therefore anterior to the criticisms in *Moralisme et littérature* which were written a few weeks before Rivière's death and, as M. Fernandez suggests in his Preface, may be regarded as his literary testament.

tradition; but he also realized that there could never be a return to the sort of poetry that was written in the seventeenth century and that the discoveries of the Romantics could not be disregarded. He therefore proposed a fresh synthesis of the two. The solution is stated in 'Reconnaissance à Dada' and in *Moralisme et littérature*:

Il faut que nous renoncions au subjectivisme, à l'effusion, à la création pure, à la transmigration du moi, et à cette prétention de l'objet qui nous a précipités dans le vide. Il faut qu'un mouvement subtil de notre esprit l'amène à se doubler à nouveau. Il faut qu'il reprenne foi en une réalité distincte de sa puissance, qu'il arrive à distinguer à nouveau en lui un instrument et une matière. Il importe surtout que l'esprit critique cesse de nous apparaître comme essentiellement stérile et que nous sachions redécouvrir sa vérité créatrice, son pouvoir de transformation. Nous ne pourrions nous renouveler que si l'acte de l'écrivain se rapproche franchement de l'effort de comprendre... Il faudra que le monde irréel qu'il a pour mission de susciter naisse seulement de son application à reproduire le réel et que le mensonge artistique ne soit plus engendré que par la passion de la vérité.¹

Finally:

Il faut profiter de la grande opération accomplie par Rousseau et par le romantisme. à savoir l'introduction de l'individu dans la littérature. Il faut la considérer comme révolue et s'en réjouir; mais il faut s'opposer aux méthodes qui l'ont permise. Il faut reprendre la méthode classique pour la représentation de ce même individu qui n'a pu être capté d'abord que par les sortilèges romantiques, que par tout ce travail d'appréciation, de qualification qui a commencé avec Rousseau. Il faut s'approcher de l'être particulier avec la même religion, à la fois, et le même effort de définition, que Racine employait à saisir et à peindre les particularités du sentiment. Il faut faire peser sur lui le même instinct borné et profond, la même masse d'intelligence sensible.

Où si vous voulez, il nous faut entrer maintenant dans la fiction romanesque et dramatique en *ennemis jurés de toute falsification*,² avec la mesure et la pénétration des classiques, avec leur horreur pour tous les jugements précipités et, pour tout dire, en un mot, avec le goût de la vie.³

These extracts will, perhaps, be sufficient to show that Rivière was strong where so many distinguished French critics have been painfully weak. He possessed a perfectly clear conception of the function of literature; he wrote his criticism from a definite standpoint; but instead of allowing this to distort his sensibility and to narrow the scope of his work, he turned it into a source of strength. For this reason, his work has a breadth and clarity which are rare in French criticism. He did not try to fit literature into some personal philosophical system; he saw clearly the lines along which it was developing; and he used criticism not to demolish a theory for purely polemical purposes, but to try to influence the artist. Few modern critics, indeed, have possessed so clear a conception of 'the function of criticism at the present time'. Lastly, he was, unlike many French critics, an unusually discriminating interpretative critic because he realized that the starting point of criticism is, as a living English critic once put it, 'the particular arrangements of words on a page' and not an

¹ *N.R.F.*, August 1920, pp. 236-7.

² Montaigne.

³ *Moralisme et littérature*, pp. 82-3.

imaginary abstract problem. For this reason, when he speaks of 'Classic' and 'Romantic', 'tradition' and 'intelligence', the words are not mere counters; they represent particular qualities which Rivière has perceived in the study of his texts, they have a precise meaning which illuminates the author whom he is discussing. We can, I think, apply to his own writings the memorable words which he once used to describe the French tradition:

Il existe quelque chose, en dehors de Rousseau, de fort, de puissant, de juste, d'imperturbable, d'impitoyable, une manière directe, stricte et réservée de voir les sentiments, un instinct positif, une lucidité sans phrases, une aptitude à se passer d'appuis et de consolations en face du chaos de l'âme humaine, une délimitation immédiate de ce qui s'y offre de connaissable, qui sont les vertus proprement françaises, et qui ont amené des résultats, aussi bien au point de vue psychologique qu'esthétique, dont on ne soulignera jamais assez l'irremplaçable importance.¹

MARTIN TURNELL.

LONDON.

¹ *Moralisme et littérature*, p. 66.

THE ENIGMA OF THE LIZARD IN ARAGONESE DIALECT

THE selection of a title which shall not be a paragraph in itself is to the philologist an ever-recurring problem. Let us therefore explain, lest in the above instance clarity should have been sacrificed to the sister virtue of brevity, that in speaking of the lizard we include the two common species, the little grey lizard (*Lacerta agilis*)¹ and the large green lizard (*Lacerta viridis*); further, that the district comprised by our investigations is chiefly Upper Aragon, bounded on the north by the French frontier, on the south by the line Huesca-Barbastro, and to the east and west, linguistically speaking, by Catalan and Basque respectively. As for the enigma, we refer the reader to Prof. G. Rohlfs.

In his recent book, *Le Gascon, Études de Philologie Pyrénéenne* (Halle, 1935), this scholar writes (p. 22):

Parmi les noms du petit lézard gris il y a en Gascogne plusieurs dénominations qui offrent un certain rapport phonétique avec les noms basques du reptile. Comme au point de vue de leur étymologie les noms sont tout à fait énigmatiques, rien n'est plus vraisemblable qu'ici encore il s'agisse des dernières survivances de l'ancienne langue ibérique.

There follows a list of names of the little grey lizard in south-west France, and then we read:

Au même groupe appartiennent peut-être les formes aragonaises, *sargantana*, *sagardana*, *changardana*, *sangardana*, *zirgandana*, *lingardana*, cat. *sargantana*, roussill. *singlantana*. Il n'y a aucun mot basque qui corresponde directement à ces formes. Pourtant on peut constater une certaine parenté entre les formes romanes et les formes basques dans le rythme des mots. En basque aussi, les dénominations du petit lézard sont presque toujours de quatre syllabes, cf. *sangongillu*, *surangilla*, *sumandilla*, *sugandela*, *suskandera*, *sigulinda*, *sugalinda*, etc.

The Castilian name of the small grey lizard is *lagartija*; though possessing the same rhythm as the Basque and Pyrenean forms, this term derives manifestly from the Latin *LACERTA*. In Aragon its names are numerous, but they fall readily into certain groups, and the aim of the present article is to demonstrate that they too, without exception, derive from *LACERTA*;²

¹ Or *muralis*? cf. G. Bertoni, *Rom.* XLII, 161. 'Con la *lacerta muralis* il volgo confonde la così detta *lacerta agilis*.'

² We should recall that *sangartana* has already been associated by scholars with *LACERTA*. Thus in the work of G. Bertoni (*Romana*, XLII, 166) we read. 'il tipo *LACERTA* (-US) . . . prese la via del mare sotto l'aspetto di **LACERTUS* (-A), come è manifesto per lo spagn. *lagarto*, *lagartija*, arag. *sangartana*, catal. *llagardass*, port. *lagartixa*.' We are unable, however, to discover any previous attempt to explain the evolution by which *LACERTA* could produce the Aragonese form; M. Rohlfs does not mention the possibility of such a derivation.

consequently, that no theory of Iberian influence is necessary to explain them¹

Our first task must be to recapitulate the Aragonese forms in greater detail. In doing so we will divide them into groups, as follows:²

- (a) *sagardana* (3), *ċagardana* (2), *šagardana* (1).
- (b) *sargatana* (1), *ċargatana* (2).
- (c) *sargantana* (7), *ċargantana* (1), *šargantana* (2),
sargandana (1), *šargandana* (1), *ċargandana* (1).
- (d) *sangardana* (1), *ċangardana* (1).
- (e) *šardagana* (3), *šardangana* (1), *sandangrana* (1).
- (f) *singardana* (1), *šingardana* (1), *ċingardana* (3),
singartata (1), *ċingalantera* (1).
- (g) *lingardana* (1), *lingardayšina* (1).
- (h) *engardiša*, (1), *engardayšina* (2).

The types (f)–(h) are found in a region comprising the former county of Ribagorza, and the eastern parts of Sobrarbe; as is well known, changing political conditions have resulted in the creation here of an area of very mixed speech. Types (a)–(e) are localized in the more characteristically Aragonese districts of the north-west and north-centre: we should observe, however, that *sargantana* is the form of literary Catalan, while the ALF. (No. 766) shows *sergantana* side by side with *singlantana* in Roussillon. Essentially similar to the types (a)–(e) are the forms of the south and south-west: *sagardiana* (1), *sargardiana* (2), and *sagwardiana* (1).³ The only forms we discovered in the entire region which do not fall into the above classification are: *saldardana* (1), in the north-centre, *ċuryagana* (1), in the extreme south, and *kolembrina* (1), in the north-east.

¹ From the Gascon and Bearnese forms we are unable to lift the veil: some, as we shall attempt to show, would appear to have the same source as those of Aragonese and a similar development; others may have nothing more in common than certain consonants which are universally 'serpentine'. As for the Basque forms quoted by M. Rohlfs, we can only observe that the influence, if influence there has been, has probably acted in the direction usual in this region: as has been shown by M. Gavel, the influence of the neighbouring Romance on Basque has been far more considerable than that of Basque, or of the presumed Iberian substratum, on the Pyrenean dialects.

² The basis of this classification is Map no. 23 of our thesis (*De Quelques Affinités Phonétiques entre l'Aragonais et le Béarnais*, Droz, 1938), a reference to which will indicate the localities in which each form is used. The figures in brackets after each name show the number of villages, among the forty-eight of our original investigations, in which the different forms were noted, and thereby give some idea of their relative frequency. In the transcription *ċ*=zeta [θ], *š*=Eng. *sh*, *ċ*=Cast. *ch*, *ĭ*=Cast. *ll*. Except where indicated, the tonic accent falls on the penultimate syllable.

³ The ending *-yana* is probably due to the analogy of the names of the large green lizard, some of which, as will be observed, end with the augmentative suffix *-aċo*, while others show the Aragonese form *-yaċo*, which derives from *-ellum*, but would seem to have lost its original diminutive force.

To explain these many forms we would first postulate that in early Aragonese the little grey lizard was called **lagartana*, a name deriving like the Cast. *lagartija* from LACERTA, but with the characteristic Pyrenean suffix *-ana*; used with the article the term would be **la lagartana*. It would be small wonder that the Aragonese should shorten this to **la gartana*: examples of the loss of initial *l* of LACERTA, through deglutination, are quite common in the Romance speeches (cf. G. Bertoni, *loc. cit.*). Let us now further suppose—a point to which we shall return later—that in Old Aragonese there also existed an article *so*, *sa*, (< IPSUM, -A). Then side by side with **la gartana* we should have **sa gartana*, is it not very feasible that when the article from IPSUM ceased to be used **sagartana* should be construed as a single word?

If this be conceded, then type (a) cited above, *sagardana*, etc., is simply **sagartana*, with the voicing of *t* after *r* which is usual in Aragonese, while type (b), *sargatana*, etc., is the same form with anticipation of the *r*. In type (c), *sargantana*, etc., we have type (b) with an additional *n* due to anticipation of the *n* of the suffix—the voicing of *t* after *n* to be observed in many of the Aragonese forms is another feature of the dialect, as is also the passage of initial *s* to *š* or *č*. Type (d), *sangardana*, etc., is type (c) with metathesis of the *r* and the first *n*. Type (e), *sardagana*, etc., shows the various phenomena illustrated in the previous types, together with metathesis of the *d* and the *g*. In types (f), *singardana*, etc., (g), *lingardana*, etc., and (h) *engardiša*, etc., we find a change in the quality of the initial vowel—this may be explained as a dissimilation, but we recall that the instability in Aragonese of the unstressed initial vowel was observed by the earliest writers on the subject. Type (g) is interesting as showing the only examples of the survival in this word of the *l* of either ILLUM or LACERTA to the detriment of the *s* of IPSA; in the isolated form *salardana* both forms of article have been incorporated, while the *g* from LACERTA has been lost. The change of suffix to be observed in *singartata*, classified under type (f), extends further west into Pallars, for which district M. J. Corominas records *sengatalla*, *singuetalla* (*Butll. de Dial. Cat.*, XXIII, 309). Influence of another word may account for the form *čuryagana*, but in all probability it is simply another phonetic variation. Only in the one remaining form do we find a word which cannot be explained by LACERTA; it is *kolembriana*, which obviously derives from COLUBRA (cf. Sicil. *culuxerta*, *coluxerta*, < COLUBRA + LACERTA, G. Bertoni, *loc. cit.*), though the present form may have been modelled on an earlier word similar to the neighbouring *lingardana*.

The plausibility of the above theory now depends on our proving the former existence in Aragon of an article deriving from IPSUM.

That this is probable is at once apparent. In medieval MSS. from all parts of the Peninsula IPSE is frequently used as an article, without demonstrative force. It is moreover well known that the article *es (so) sa sos sas*, still used in the archaic Catalan of Majorca, was current on the Catalan mainland as late, at least, as the thirteenth century (A. Griera, *Gramàtica Històrica del Català Antic*, p. 77). In the fourteenth century these forms were proscribed as 'barbarisms' by the *Leys d'Amors*. Relics of their former use are also to be found in Gascony in such names as *Sacase* (La Maison), *Sarrieu* (La Rivière), *Sapène* (Le Rocher), etc.; similar forms are to be found in the oldest Latin MSS. of the Abbaye de l'Escale Dieu in the province of Bigorre: *ecclesia de sa Lana*, *ecclesia de sa Caubera*, *Santus des Bosc* (quoted from A. Luchaire by G. Rohlf's, *op. cit.*, p. 118). It would therefore not be in any way surprising should we discover survivals of the same kind in Aragonese. whether these be due to the primitive use of the article IPSUM in the Aragonese region, or to the long period of Catalan influence consequent upon the alliance of the two states in the Middle Ages, is difficult, if not impossible, to determine, but the problems surrounding the evolution of Aragonese have no particular bearing on the question at present under consideration.

We have therefore to ask: what other relics of the use of IPSUM as an article can we discover in modern Aragonese? Admittedly, few; yet the small harvest which our researches have yielded should prove to be of sufficient quality to convince all but the most sceptical.¹

The villagers of Upper Aragon distinguish carefully, in their speech, between a mountain-flank facing the sun, and one which is usually in the shade; the former is called the *solano* or the *solanero*, while the latter, over the greater part of the region, is the *pako*, and in the eastern valleys, the *ubago* or *obago* (<OPACUM). The exact distribution of these forms is shown by Map no. 16 of our thesis. At Benasque alone there exists a form *sobago*; while one should not forget the possibility of the influence in this case of some other word (we have suggested the Arag. *soba*, 'cavern', *op. cit.*, p. 96), it seems highly probable that the initial *so-* is

¹ One should observe that according to the example of *sagardana*, etc., if the proposed etymology is correct, the -rs- of IPSUM may be represented in Aragonese by either *s*, *š*, or *č*. The first of these developments is the normal form of Castilian (cf. *ese*); the second is that of Catalan (cf. *mateix*, *màtex*); the equivalence *s-č* is frequently found in Aragonese (cf. A. Kuhn, 'Der Hocharagonesische Dialekt', *R.L.R.*, XI, in which a chapter, p. 99, is entitled 'Der Wechsel θ-s'). In two of the examples given below we also find the form *č*: this may be explained by the phonetic proximity of *č* and *š*, both of which sounds correspond in Aragonese to the *jota* of Castilian (e.g. Cast. *junco*, Arag. *čungo*; Cast. *quejigo*, Arag. *kašiko*).

simply the former article *so*, deriving from *IPSUM*; incidentally, it is by no means unlikely that the disappearance of the initial *o* in the more widespread form, leaving *pako*, is due to the death of the definite article in the expression **so opako*, reduced to **so pako*.

This isolated example from Benasque may seem to lose in value from the fact that the village in question is situated in Eastern Aragon, near the Catalan border. We are able, however, to produce another example, similarly isolated, from the extreme west of Aragon.

Near the Basque Country, in the small town of Hecho, the '*vertedero de aguas sucias*' is known as *sokanitato* (A. Kuhn, *Der Hocharagonesische Dialekt*, p. 177). Now the usual terms in Aragonese for any form of spout or gutter to carry water are *kanal*, *kanaleia*. The antiquity of the use of this radical in Aragonese is proved by its very frequent appearance in place-names; thus we find springs bearing the names *kanaleta* (Biescas) and *kananeta* (Morcat), a ravine at Osia is called the *barranco de a kanaleta*; numerous small fields have similar names, e.g. *a kanaleta* (Ascaso), *kananito* (Banaston), *as kanaliças* (Fanlo), *kanalaéo* (Biescas). Despite the dissimilation of the second *a* it would seem very probable that *sokanitato* has the same origin, and that the initial *so* is the former article.

A further example is suggested by the Aragonese names of the mountain-goat. On the northern slope this animal bears such names as *isart*, *isar*, *idart*, *sarri* (G. Rohlfs, *op. cit.*, p. 21), whence the French *isard*, accepted by the Academy in 1878. The origin of this term is mysterious, and it is generally considered to be of pre-Romance stock, although there is no equivalent term in modern Basque. According to M. W. Giese it is probably cognate with the Basque *izar*, 'star'; thus the names would be due to the white patch on the animal's forehead. However that may be, what is of more immediate interest to us is the presence in Aragon of a number of forms obviously similar in origin, some of which commence with *i*, and others with *i* preceded by the consonant *s*, *š* or *č*. The most widespread term in Aragon is *sarrio*. This form is quoted by Borao and defined thus: *cabra montés; quizá del francés Isard (Diccionario de Voces Aragonesas*, 2nd ed. Zaragoza, 1908); in the same work, however, we find the term *sisardo*, with the brief definition: *cuadrúpedo; capra rupicapra*. Unfortunately Borao does not indicate the source of the words he collected, but, having never heard mention among the Pyrenean peasants of more than one kind of mountain goat, we may assume that his *sarrio* and his *sisardo* are one and the same animal. This assumption is moreover justified by the presence in certain villages of Upper Aragon of types

similar to *sisardo*. At Benasque the current form is *išarso*, while at Bielsa our informant pronounced *čičarč*, pl. *čičarčes* (the final *č* of the singular form represents an earlier *ts*, and thus conceals a plural, cf. *kweba del esforáč*, in which *foráč* represents *forats*, 'holes'—*De Quelques Affinités*, p. 43 n.). To this latter locality, as well as to Plan, M. Rohlfs attributes the form *čičardo* (*loc. cit.*); at Espuña he recorded a form *šišardo*, resembling more closely the *sisardo* of Borao.

While a derivation from *IPSUM* would seem to be the most acceptable explanation of the initial consonant in the above forms, one might suggest that it is due to anticipation of the *s* of '*isard*'. No such explanation is possible, however, in the case of the following example.

The common nettle is known generally in Upper Aragon by the name *šordika*, side by side with which we find the variants. *ordika*, *ordiga*, *sordika*, *šordiga*, *sordiga*, *čordika*, *čordiga*, *išordika*, *išordiga*, *eyšordiga*; the last three of these forms are limited to the Eastern valleys. In Bearn the most usual forms are *urtiko*, *urtigo*, but within a restricted area one also finds *hurtiko*, *hurtigo* (*De Quelques Affinités...*, Map no. 19).

It is manifest that the basis of all these forms is the Latin *URTICA*, but Pyrenean researchers have been considerably puzzled by the variety of initial phonemes. Thus the pioneer, J. Saroihandy, writes of them: 'C'est un type *EX-URTICA qui a prévalu dans presque tout le Haut-Aragon' ('Vestiges de phonétique ibérienne en territoire roman', *Revue Internat. des Études Basques*, VII, 1913, p. 491 n.). One may well wonder, however, why the prefix *EX* should have attached itself to a substantive of this type. The improbability of such an explanation has prompted later researchers to seek elsewhere, and most of them have been led to connect the *šordika* form of Aragon with the *hurtiko* form of Bearn. That the latter derives from a former **FURTICA* is proved by the widespread use of forms with initial *f*- in Southern Italy, but **FURTICA* offers no satisfactory explanation of *šordika*. M. Alwin Kuhn suggests two possible analogies, both ingenious but neither going beyond the stage of hypothesis (*op. cit.*, p. 59). M. Rohlfs remarks that certain of the Aragonese forms seem to derive from a type **jurtica*, but refrains from any attempt to explain this type. The simple explanation which we offer is that the mysterious initial consonant represents the -*ps*- of *IPSA*; the forms *išordika*, *eyšordiga*, etc., would thus suggest, for the Eastern region, a former article *iša*, *eyša*.

Another example is probably to be found in the word *čurikera*, which, at Banastón, near the Catalan frontier, is the name of the rabbit-

hole. In the western half of the region this meaning is expressed by the form *olikera*, but in the neighbourhood of Banastón we find such forms as *lorikera*, *lodrikera*, *dolikera*, *forikera*, which seem to suggest that the initial syllable of this word has been involved in difficulties arising from the variety of definite articles. The form *čurikera* may be compared with one of the names of the little grey lizard, *čuryagana*. All these forms probably have their origin in a type *LAURICARIA, formed on the classical LAUREX (*De Quelques Affinités* . . , p. 98 and Map no. 17).

It is difficult to find any certain example of the alternative masculine singular form *es* (representing an IPSE accented on the first syllable), on account of the many sources from which an initial *es* may derive. The difficulty is increased in Aragon by the existence of a masc. plur. *es*, which is still used in the district of Bielsa (cf. J. Saroihandy, *op. cit.*, p. 488, n.). This *es* is probably a reduction of *els* (<ILLOS), the plural form of the neighbouring valley of Benasque. We will, however, quote one word as showing a probable survival of *es* (<IPSE): in Castilian the wild thyme is called *tomillo*; at Benasque we find the name *tremonsito*, at Bielsa *tremončito*, at Torla *estremončito*.

A survey of place-names provides us with a few more possible examples. M. Alwin Kuhn gives the name of a mountain-sector at Hecho as *divisoria de la sokarrač de lemto* (*op. cit.*, p. 232); at Torla he found the name as *karračinas* (*op. cit.*, p. 209). The *karrač* in these two forms is almost certainly one and the same word, in which case *sokarrač* offers another example of IPSUM. M. Kuhn attempts to explain the form *karračinas* by KARR-, 'rock', (REW. 1696*a*) or CARRASCA, 'oak-tree', (REW. 1718*a*). We have a simpler explanation to suggest: *karrač* is in all probability a disguised plural of *karrač* (<QUADRATUM), an example of an evolution *-ts* > *-č* mentioned previously, and which must have taken place at an early date; semantically this explanation presents no difficulty.

A mountain near Linás de Broto is called *Soaso*, and another, some distance to the south-west, at Ayerbe, bears the name of *Saso*. We find no trace on the map of Aragon of a place called *Aso*, but *José Aso* was the name of our informant at Biescas, and since a large proportion of the surnames of our informants are identical with the names of neighbouring villages and hamlets, it seems very likely that *José Aso* derives his name from the same source. A similar example is to be found in the name of the hamlet *Sasé*, which may be compared with that of the neighbouring village *Burgasé*.

The sum of the above examples should suffice to persuade us of the former vitality in Aragon of an article derived from IPSE, and thereby

confirm, so far as confirmation is possible, the etymology by which we explain the Aragonese names of the small grey lizard. Before we conclude, however, there is a last example to be adduced, and perhaps the most revealing: it concerns the names of the large green lizard.

Although the two commoner types of lizard are so easily distinguished, literary Latin has but one name, *LACERTA* (*LACERTUS*), for both. Thus it is that in some Romance dialects the two closely-related reptiles have names of entirely different origin. In standard Italian the little grey lizard is *lucertola*, due to the influence of *LUCE* on *LACERTA*, whereas the name of the large green lizard is *ramarro*, the source of which is obscure. Similarly, on the northern slope of the Pyrenees, the present forms by which they are designated and distinguished would appear to have little in common.¹

Not so in Spain. The Castilian forms *lagarto* and *lagartija* show that the two reptiles have always been closely associated in the minds of Castilian speakers. In Aragon, too, there is obviously a strong natural tendency to adjust the two names in such a way that the one shall be a diminutive of the other, or more precisely, to maintain the original relationship in face of the disturbance due to phonetic evolution and analogical influences. In some villages this tendency has completely succeeded. Thus at Aragués del Puerto, in the western area, the small grey lizard is the *éargatana*, and the large green lizard is the *éargataço*, while at Laspuña, to the

¹ In Bearnese the large green lizard is variously called *linčér*, *linčerno*, *linkér*, *linkerno*, *linšér*, *lawšér*, *lawzér*, *luzérp*, *luzér*, *lansérp*, *landér* (*De Quelques Affinités* . . ., Map No 24). These forms in all probability have a common basis *LACERTU*, influenced by *LUCE* and by *SERPE*, and showing also the types **LICERTA* and **LANCERTA* by which M. G. Bertoni explains a number of Italian dialect varieties; it may be noted that an almost exactly similar form to the Bearnese *linčerno* is used in the Upper Engadine, a fact which is sufficient to dispose in this case of any question of Iberian influence.

In order to facilitate a comparison with the Bearnese names of the small grey lizard we will here recapitulate them, according to the results of our own investigations; reading our map from west to east we have *šingardana*, *šisanglo*, *sanguziò*, *segundino*, *kawziyo*, *sindá*, *sendá*, *sentá*, *séndo*, *séndro*, *sinawlo*, *singrawièto*, *sengrawièto*, *sarnato*, *sernato*, *sernço*. Of these, *šingardano*, found only at Montory, near the Basque frontier, is almost identical with certain of the Eastern Aragonese forms, and would thus appear to derive from *LACERTA*; *segundino*, peculiar to Lescun, suggests a similar origin. From the forms *singrawièto*, *sengrawièto* we may deduce that in certain villages the Bearnese have felt the need of strengthening an earlier *séndo* (perhaps on account of reduction of *-nd-* to *-n-*, which may have taken place much later in some localities than in others), for *grawto* is none other than the usual Bearnese name for the frog (<*RANUNCULA*). Although we find it impossible to offer any sound etymology for *sentá*, *sendá*, etc., we strongly suspect that they are in reality mutilated forms of **SAGERTANA*, for the intervocalic *-n-* commonly disappears in Bearn, and so does, in many words, the intervocalic *-g-* (G. Rohlfis, *op. cit.*, p. 83). If this were so, then the Aragonese and Bearnese forms would have a common basis, and this theory is strongly supported by the fact that in central Bearn and western Aragon the common suffix is *-ANA*, while in the east of Bearn and in Bigorre the suffix is *-ACULA*, as in eastern Aragon and Pallars. These forms would thus offer an example of a very early Romance word-frontier, crossing the Pyrenees from north to south, a frontier of which we gave other examples in our thesis, and which, to our gratification, was deemed by one of the reviewers to be of particular interest.

east, their names are respectively *engardayšina* and *engardayšo*. But such an appropriate balance between the two names is, in the modern dialect, the exception rather than the rule. In many villages they have lost contact completely, although it is still apparent to the philologist that they derive from the same source.

We explain this position by the fact that the tendency to create forms *semantically* logical was opposed, in this case, by an equally strong, and sometimes stronger, tendency to the creation of forms *grammatically* logical. The conflict arose thus: Everywhere in Upper Aragon, as most usually in Castile, the names of the little grey lizard are feminine, whereas those of the large green lizard are masculine. It follows that in the names of the little grey lizard the initial *la* of LACERTA could be detached and used as the article, side by side with the alternative *sa*, without any loss of grammatical consistency; but when the Aragonese sought to adapt the names of the large green lizard to this development (the little grey lizard being much the commoner of the two species, its names would naturally serve as model), they were confronted by the fact that *la*, or *sa*, could not be employed as article with a substantive having a masculine termination. The result of this conflict of divided loyalties is seen in the fact that, while by far the greater part of the names of the little grey lizard begin with *sa* (*ša* or *ča*), the variety in the names of the large green lizard is most noticeable in the initial syllable.

Certain of these names, in all ten out of the forty-eight noted, have followed faithfully the course set by the names of the little grey lizard. The most frequent is *sagardačo*, found in four localities; elsewhere we recorded one example each of *čargatačo*, *čargaračo*, *čargargačo*, *šagardyačo*, *čargadačo*, *sangrandäčo*. It should be observed that the most widespread form is the one which, according to our etymology, is the basis of the others.

The remaining forms differ considerably, but they have a common feature in that they seem to reflect a general reluctance to use an initial syllable which might be a feminine article. We present them for the contemplation of the reader: *gardačo* (1), *largandačo* (1), *lagardačo* (1), *lingardayšo* (4), *engardašo* (1), *singardayšo* (1), *engardayšo* (2), *alagarto* (1), *algardačo* (6).¹

¹ The total of forty-eight is completed by *lagarto* (10), *langarto* (4), and *fardačo* (2). The Castilian form is used not only in the southern region most exposed to Castilian influence, but also in certain of the most remote villages; its ready adoption in these places would seem to indicate a very comprehensible 'dissatisfaction' with the previous local name. The *n* of *langarto* is most probably due to influence on *lagarto* of the local names of the small grey lizard (*čangardana*, *čingardana*), but it must be noted that a type *LANCERTA is also found in Italy. With regard to *fardačo*, our first impulse was to attribute to it an

Certain of these words invite further comment. Thus in the form *gardačo*, used in a village on the western frontier of Aragon, we have proof of the reality of deglutination in the derivatives of *LACERTA* in Spain, which hitherto we have only postulated. Most curious of all, however, is the form *algardačo*, used in no less than six of the localities explored, comprising the neighbourhood of Jaca, and a considerable area north and south of that centre, bordering moreover on the district in which we find *gardačo*. It would appear from this form that the inhabitants, having rejected (one would imagine with a certain despair!) both initial *la-* and initial *sa-* (*ša-* or *ča*), and recoiling before the more drastic method of suppressing the initial syllable completely, have ingeniously and most effectively solved their problem by a metathesis of the initial *la-*, thereby obtaining the Arabic *masculine* article; this solution is manifestly well supported by the presence in literary Castilian of a number of words to which the Arabic article has been agglutinated. One may even wonder whether the name *algardačo* did not thus enter, at least partially, into the psychological orbit of such words as *alguacil*, *alcalde*, *alcázar*, etc. To anyone familiar with the large green lizard in its natural surroundings, who has suddenly become aware of it, squatting firmly on a rock, fixing the intruder with a rigid aggressive stare, this suggestion will surely not appear too fanciful. There is, moreover, evidence of a very similar play of the popular imagination in the form *sangrandačo*, used at Panticosa; this form has obviously been influenced by *san* (< *SANCTUM*) and *grande*, an association which is admirably supported by the augmentative value of the suffix.

The full significance of the other forms can only be apprehended by a comparison between the names of the two species as used in each individual locality. As typical examples of the extreme degree of detachment reached between them we may mention that in the village where the large green lizard is *tagardačo* the little grey lizard is *čagardana*, while in another locality the forms used are respectively *alagarto* and *salaršana*.

It is in the eastern region that a compromise has been most successfully established. Here the difficulty provoked by the identity of the initial syllable with the feminine article has been circumvented by a change in

origin similar to that of *gardačo*, explaining the present form by associative etymology, rather than by an unusual phonetic evolution—the French *farder* and the Spanish *fardar*, ‘to dress out’, might very aptly be associated with a reptile so brightly coloured; on reference to the *Diccionario de la Academia*, however, we find that *fardacho* is given as a name of the large green lizard in Castilian, and an Arabic *ferdej* is quoted as its origin. We are unaware of the source of this etymology, as of the extent to which *fardacho* is used in the Peninsula.

the quality of the initial vowel, and the same change has taken place in the names of both species, thus permitting of a retention of contact.

The bearing of this analysis of the names of the large green lizard on our attempt to establish the etymology of the names of the little grey lizard has now doubtless become apparent. On the one hand, we have names of the little grey lizard beginning with *sa-* (*ša-* or *ĉa-*), the substitution of which syllable by *la* would give us a type obviously deriving from LACERTA; on the other hand, we have advanced ample testimony to the previous existence in Aragon of an article *sa*; but the names of the little grey lizard conform so generally to a type in *sa-* that one might still view with suspicion a theory deriving them from LACERTA. The names of the large green lizard supply the missing evidence: they show us side by side *gardačo*, *sagardačo*, *ġagardačo*, which must surely derive from a common source, which can scarcely be any other than LACERTU; moreover, they bear eloquent witness to an early period of confusion in the forms of the article, when the form *sa* could have been generalized with the names of the little grey lizard, to be firmly agglutinated as its grammatical function became extinct.¹

W. D. ELCOCK.

SHEFFIELD.

¹ We have unfortunately not been able to consult the following works in which the names of the lizard are studied: E. Klett, *Die Romanischen Eidechsenamen unter bes. Berücksichtigung von Frankreich u. Italien*, Tübingen, 1934, and A. Griera, 'Entorn de l'Atlas Linguistique de l'Italie et de la Suisse méridionale', *Anuari de l'Oficina Romànica*, 1, Barcelona, 1928. It is, however, very unlikely that they have anticipated our theory, since both are previous to the work of Professor Rohlfs to which we have referred, while M. Klett is the latter's pupil.

RILKE AND TOLSTOY

FLIES on the wall have all the fun at those famous meetings between great men of which such partial and tantalizing traditions remain. The untutored utterances of George III after his historic audience to Johnson in the Queen's Library would have formed a pleasing pendant no doubt to the classic phrase: 'It was not for me to bandy civilities with my Sovereign.' Yet sometimes to know more is to know less. The words: 'Mr Livingstone, I presume?' echoing through Darkest Africa entirely dominate the subsequent conversation, and epitomize the men and the moment in the grand symbolical manner. On the other hand, one cannot but regret that Napoleon should have been so laconic about Goethe, however much of solemn significance can be read into the words: 'Vous êtes un homme', and 'Voilà un homme'. Nor can one help wishing that Goethe himself had not waited sixteen years before writing up his guarded account of the interview. Yet in one's heart one knows that the balmy atmosphere of mutual admiration and high esteem which made this encounter so gratifying to all concerned precluded the possibility of psychological realism.

The notice Goethe wrote in his diary on 2 October 1824, 'Heine from Göttingen', is all that is known for certain about a very different kind of meeting, the course of which did not run smooth. Goethe, who was incapable of lying, never mentioned the occasion again; Heine kept a stricken silence for seven months. The eager, thrusting young intellectual had already laid his poems at Goethe's feet and now came to prostrate himself in person. If his brother Max is to be believed, a most trivial conversation took place which circled haltingly round the avenue of poplars between Jena and Weimar. Finally Goethe, aged seventy-five, asked Heine, aged twenty-seven, what he was occupied with at the moment. The latter had no more worldly wisdom than to own that he was working at a *Faust*. Goethe retaliated by enquiring acidly into his further business in Weimar; at which unmistakable hint Heine made himself scarce. The snub (for a snub of some sort there had been) rankled terribly. Heine kept it to himself and salved his hurt pride by private descriptions of Goethe's great sympathy and kindness, his shocking state of physical decay; his frivolity, materialism and egotism. The personal animus endured and was responsible for some cutting public criticisms, but never at the expense of Goethe's poetical genius. Heine's great

reckoning with the 'politically indifferent' pagan was made after the latter's death in *Die Romantische Schule*. It is vivid, brilliant and penetrated with violently mixed feelings of scorn and admiration, and it concludes with a fanciful account of the fatal interview eleven years before. Heine described Goethe in all the majesty of age, a sublime and awe-inspiring Zeus, to whom he could think of nothing more significant to say, than that the plums on the way between Jena and Weimar tasted very sweet. Compared with his private descriptions of a yellow toothless mummy, this public tribute to the personal beauty of the Olympian who had practically shown him the door speaks well for Heine's magnanimity.

Rilke's journeys to Russia once more recall Goethe to one's mind and prompt one to recapitulate all that Italy stood for in the latter's life. This however brings one up against the strange fact that Goethe was throughout hardly conscious of the real Italy he was travelling in, and certainly did not like it, except as a country peculiarly propitious to his classical dreams. After the first long visit, he returned once and never again, though the opportunities were innumerable, and though his plans to do so were many. But he remained away, living on his memories, and declaring to Eckermann towards the end of his life, that he had never really known what it was to be happy since he had left Italy. His unexpressed reluctance to repeat for a third time an experience which the second visit had greatly and avowedly dimmed favours the interpretation that it was an unreal Italy which he adopted as his spiritual home, invested with the arbitrary glamour of the portrait painted of him by Tischbein, reclining on an obelisk in Roman costume amidst marble bas-reliefs in the Campagna, with the Forum in the distance. Allowing for the difference in age, race and temperament, Rilke's relationship with Russia was a curious repetition of this emotional geographical history, even down to the portrait in a Russian peasant's blouse which was painted of him by Pasternak with the Kremlin in the background.

Goethe was seeking for Ancient Greece in Italy, Rilke set out to discover the Russian God, the Russian peasant and the Russian soul. *Das Stundenbuch* bears eloquent testimony to the religious inspiration which Russia granted him; and this perhaps accounts for the fact that the personal contacts were less fruitful. In my opinion he no more saw the real Russia than Goethe saw the real Italy, for Rilke travelled through that vast and tragic country almost in a trance. Twenty-four years of age, shrinking, sensitive, melting and gentle, the most melodious, nebulous and ethereal of poets (as he was then), living for poetry and for poetry alone, one rather shudders to think that he was bound on a

pilgrimage which was to include a visit to Tolstoy, that sublime but terrible genius of seventy-two, who was then, and had been for many years, a most virulent and damaging opponent of the 'illusion', as he called it, of art.

But Rilke knew no misgivings. With his Russian friend Lou Andreas-Salomé (who had innocently wrought such havoc in Nietzsche's life) and her husband Andreas, professor of oriental languages in the University of Göttingen, he boldly set out to discover a country which, on the strength of a seven weeks' visit in 1899 and another of four months in 1900, was to become his permanent spiritual home. Both these visits were made in the spring and summer, so that the cruelty of a Russian winter was never among his experiences. Moscow at Easter and the steppe in flower henceforth and forever provided a misty background to his uprooted, nomadic existence, although, like Goethe, he omitted to return for a third time to the country of his choice.

There are three different full-length accounts of the visit made to Tolstoy in Yasnaya Polyana in May 1900. The first, for a long time the authorized version, was concocted in a letter to a Russian friend, Sofia Schill, the day after the event. The second, which one might call apocryphal, was an incomplete poetical reminiscence, the rough draft of a letter to his fellow-pilgrim Lou, to be found in his diary under the date of 15 September 1900. It was written in Worpswede on hearing that Tolstoy was very ill. The revised version which held the field at the end of Rilke's life is an oral description given to Maurice Betz twenty-five years after the visit.¹

One would naturally expect the last account to have gained in the glamour of distance what it had lost in accuracy. The reverse is the case. The impression the whole event made on Rilke was indelible. Time could not obliterate it; on the contrary it dissolved the mists of romance in which it had been shrouded. The devotion to truth learned from Rodin helped this process as well as the penetrating shrewdness of his French listeners; so that this late version of the visit is by far the most realistic and tallies more closely than the previous ones with what is known about Tolstoy in the last years of his life.

Rilke and Lou had called on Tolstoy in Moscow during the first journey to Russia in 1899. They had been given tea; and the young poet had laid

¹ R. M. Rilke, *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1899-1902, Leipzig, 1933, pp. 37 ff. and 308 ff. M. Betz, *Rilke vivant*, Paris, 1937, pp. 153 ff. There is also the less detailed account reproduced from Rilke's conversation by Charles Du Bos in his *Extraits d'un Journal*, 1908-28, Paris, 1931, pp. 272 ff. This more or less tallies with Betz's account, though there are some variations in detail.

a copy of his *Zwei Prager Geschichten* into Tolstoy's 'kind old hands'.¹ The visit evidently lasted until after midnight,² and part of it at least was spent listening to Tolstoy's violent injunctions not to encourage popular superstition and folly by their presence at the Easter celebrations, even then taking place. The visitors, too tactful or too much overawed to advertise their contrary intentions, nevertheless stole away to witness and take part in that solemn festival.³ Rilke, quite dazzled by Tolstoy's personality and kindness, described him deliriously as the most touching of persons, 'the eternal Russian',⁴ wrote to him twice from Germany, and sent him another of his books.⁵ But he insisted on admiring him pre-eminently as an artist, Tolstoy's own opinions to the contrary notwithstanding.⁶

The acquaintanceship was therefore a very slight one, and Rilke and Lou were in some natural doubt as to whether or not they dared venture to call on Tolstoy in Yasnaya Polyana whilst they were staying at Tula. They were earnestly discussing the pros and cons of this plan in the train from Moscow, when a friend of theirs (Pasternak) introduced them to a friend of his (Bulansche), who was also a family friend of the Tolstoys. From that moment there was no looking back. From that moment also Russian organization reigned supreme. There were confusing doubts as to the count's whereabouts; complicated deductions based on rumours which proved to be misleading led to the despatch of an urgent telegram which produced no answer. This was followed by a sleepless night, a hopeless dawn, a false start, frantic enquiries; a railway porter, who shed light at last; a goods train, a country cart—and the two panting pilgrims were finally delivered rather early in the morning at Tolstoy's gates and tiptoed up the avenue to the house. These exciting details were poured out breathlessly to Sofia Schill as a prelude to the authorized version of the visit, which runs as follows. A servant took in their cards, the eldest son opened the glass door, and they were face to face with 'that aged man, whom one always approaches like a son, even when one does not wish to remain in the power of his fatherhood'. There he stood, older, whiter and more fragile than the year before, 'his clear shadowless eyes pondering the strangers, testing them deliberately, and involuntarily blessing them

¹ *B.u.T.*, p. 419; to Bonz, 20 April 1899.

² Du Bos, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

³ L. Andreas-Salomé, *Rainer Maria Rilke*, Leipzig, 1929, p. 19.

⁴ *B.u.T.*, p. 12; to Hugo Salus from St Petersburg, 19 May 1899.

⁵ R. M. Rilke, *Briefe aus den Jahren 1892-1904*, Leipzig, 1939, pp. 71 f. and 75. The book was probably *Larenopfer*.

⁶ *B.u.T.*, pp. 34 f., to Sofia Schill from Schmargendorf, 16 March 1900; about Tolstoy's *Resurrection*.

with an unutterable blessing'. The owner of these remarkable orbs recognized Lou at once and greeted her warmly; he then excused himself and retired, promising to be with his guests at two. Their anxieties allayed, they spent some time with the eldest son in the large reception-room, and then wandered through the wide, wild park for two hours. On their return the Countess Tolstoy was discovered in the vestibule arranging some books, and in no very pleasant humour. Icily inhospitable, she announced to the intruders that her husband was ill. Luckily they were able to say that they had already seen him, which cut the ground from under her feet, so that she was forced to allow them to enter, whilst she remained behind throwing the books about, and calling out angrily to some invisible person. 'And we've only just arrived!' Waiting anxiously in a little antechamber, they heard a young lady come in, accompanied by voices, violent sobbing, and the soothing tones of the old count, who then appeared before them, absent and distraught, asked them a few questions, and retired once more, whilst they wondered nervously whether they had come at an awkward moment. He was shortly back again however, and this time his whole attention was for them, and his great eyes encircled them. Words almost failed Rilke to describe what he felt when Tolstoy offered them as a glorious alternative to the family lunch, which they had been dreading but hoping for as a *pis-aller*, an hour alone with him in the beautiful park, in that landscape 'through which he had carried the heavy thoughts of his great life'. Being on a diet of white coffee, Rilke naïvely explained, the count had this hour at his disposal, and it was given as an unexpected gift into their hands. Thus, for a happy space, they walked through the abundance and beauty of that wild spring, Tolstoy picking herbs and flowers as he went, inhaling their aroma, and tossing them negligently away. He spoke in Russian, and Rilke understood every word except those which the wind carried off. So the walk was a good walk, he concluded triumphantly; the count seemed to grow in stature in the wind, his long beard waved, but his face remained tranquil, untouched by the storm. The two guests took their leave immediately on regaining the house and walked all the way back to Kolovska on foot, full of child-like gratitude and rich in the gifts his nature had bestowed on them. It had certainly been plain living and high thinking for the Tolstoys' guests that day; and there had undoubtedly been storms and scenes; but only the countess was to blame for these, not the fragile, fatherly, aged count, uplifting his soothing voice and distraught by the tantrums of his wife.

The apocryphal version is an attempt to recreate the impression made on

Rilke by the country, the park, the house, the pictures and the statues at Yasnaya Polyana, and his mood when he saw them. He kept to the fiction of a noble and harassed old man taming a shrew, but by reviving his own emotions he also reproduced such an atmosphere of loneliness and wistful waiting that one's heart aches for the two pilgrims at that most inhospitable shrine. 'At last' they found someone in the garden to take in their cards. And then they waited, and went on waiting; and a white dog came up to make friends with them as they stood hopefully outside the glass door. Rilke stooped to pat the dog, and on straightening himself suddenly beheld a pair of eyes peering out of a little old face, distorted by the flaws in the glass. The door opened and Lou slipped through, but it banged violently in Rilke's face, so that he crept in after the count had received Lou, and stood before his idol feeling rather too tall. Left alone with Tolstoy's eldest son, they went up a wooden staircase into a large bright reception-room with very little in it; so that they had time, and more than time, to examine the few portraits and statues very minutely. And then there was nothing to do but sit about and drink coffee, talking very little, gazing out of the window, listening to a bird with a 'creaking' voice, and 'finally' going out to look for it in the park. One hardly knows whom to pity most: the unwanted visitors or their deputy host, making painstaking conversation about portraits, birds and trees during the endless *séance* in the reception-room and the slow-moving walk in the park, from which they returned into the arms of the incensed countess, arranging her books, furious at the sight of them, and loudly complaining about their presence to some invisible person. An anxious half-hour among the walnut furniture in the little waiting-room now ensued. Lou and Rilke inspected the books in the glass cases and on the shelves; they tried to see the portraits; and all the time they were straining their ears to catch the sound of the count's footsteps. At last he was audible in the hall. But something had happened. Voices were raised, a girl was weeping, the count was comforting her; completely devoid of sympathy, the unpleasing organ of the countess was also to be heard. This was followed by steps on the stairs, and by doors opening and shutting. Then Tolstoy entered. Coldly and politely, he put a question to Lou; but his eyes were not on either of them, although he turned towards Rilke and asked him: 'And what is your occupation?' As far as the latter remembered, he managed to reply: 'I have written one or two things.'¹ The fragment

¹ Cf. Du Bos, *op cit*, p. 286; in this version, Rilke represented himself, not as having been asked the question, but as dreading it; since he would have had to answer 'poetry', and would have been lost in Tolstoy's eyes

breaks off here, leaving one with the impression of two pathetically eager and timid worshippers trying for the best part of a day to approach their idol; barely granted admittance, herded up the stairs, shooed out of doors, scolded like two children, and banished into a waiting-room. Again it was all the fault of the countess; but Tolstoy did not seem to have recognized the young poet who 'always approached him like a son'.

That the countess was not wholly or indeed even chiefly responsible for the daunting reception of Lou and Rilke at Yasnaya Polyana becomes clear in the revised version of the story as told to Maurice Betz in 1925. It was now one of those stock tales for which Rilke was so famous in his day. Many of his friends mention it. Betz heard it twice, each time with different details and Charles Du Bos once, all in the same year. Rilke was a spell-binding talker. Let him but get going in congenial society, and there was no stopping him. He could keep his audience enthralled for hours on end whilst he created or recreated for their delight some dramatic, eerie, fantastic or humorous adventure. Inexhaustible in the invention or remembrance of details, carried away himself by the fascination of the game, he yet never in all these impromptu sagas struck a single false note. It is the absence of false notes in this last edition of the Tolstoy adventure, now definitely seen to be humorous, which makes it more credible than the letter to Sofia Schill and more realistic than the reminiscence to Lou. He may have exaggerated a little and he had forgotten some of the details. The irrelevant young lady had disappeared; the countess, no longer hurling books about in the vestibule, behaved rather better, if still far from well; for if she was the villain of the piece before, her part was now cut down to leave the stage free for the count. Gone was the warm reception of the first version, vanished away the unutterable blessing in Tolstoy's eyes. Rilke acknowledged now that he hardly even pretended to recognize Lou, withdrew after a very curt greeting murmuring something indefinite about seeing them later in the day, and left them *plantés là*, until Lev Lvovitch took pity on them.¹ He was (and this at last accounts satisfactorily for his prolonged absence in both the earlier versions) in a state of the most acute exasperation when they appeared; their arrival did nothing to soothe him; and before the morning was over, he was in a towering rage. Lou and Rilke had the fearful privilege of overhearing a most violent quarrel between husband and wife when they returned from their dismal ramble in the park. They

¹ In speaking to Du Bos, Rilke claimed that Tolstoy had subjected them both to a searching cross-examination before withdrawing. I think that this is one of the 'invented' details, since his almost immediate disappearance is a constant feature in all the other versions. Cf. Du Bos, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

trembled in that little ante-room as they listened in despair to vociferations which made it clear that they ought to depart. And yet they held their ground when, during a short lull, the countess tried to turn them out. Only to hear the tempest break forth again with redoubled violence when they were left alone. The countess was sobbing, Tolstoy was shouting, doors were slammed, and the tumult, in which other persons now became involved, withdrew into the interior of the house. A sinister silence was followed by the appearance of the count to the petrified visitors. Exhausted, exasperated, with trembling hands and blank eyes, he had some difficulty in placing them, asked them a few questions at random, and vanished again without listening to the answers. Whisperings were now heard on the other side of the door: an imploring female voice, and Tolstoy's softened replies. The worst was over. Shortly afterwards their erratic host reappeared carrying a walking-stick, his eyes were quite lucid, indeed strangely piercing. 'Would you like to lunch with the others or walk with me?' he asked in a loud voice, in which impatience and irony were mingled.¹ They chose, as we know, the latter alternative, and Tolstoy strode along beside them, talking volubly and as if to himself, tearing up grasses and flowers as he went, inhaling them and flinging them down. Gradually he came to himself, but he remained an awesome figure; elemental power, force and majesty were present in everything he said. His enormous ears; his long, wild, disordered hair; his dilated nostrils, inhaling the spring with a kind of sensuality; his flowing beard; his ample prophetic gestures and his terribly acute and penetrating eyes remained forever indelibly stamped on Rilke's mind. The gentle, fragile, stooping old man of the authorized version was a counterfeit; this was the authentic Tolstoy, terrible, pitiless, majestic.²

Nous parlâmes de beaucoup de choses différentes: du paysage qui nous environnait, de la Russie, de Dieu, de la mort.... Comme il parlait russe et s'exprimait avec vivacité, je ne comprenais pas toujours toutes ses paroles.³

Das Gespräch geht über viele Dinge. Aber alle Worte gehen nicht *vorn* an ihnen vorüber, an den Außerlichkeiten, sie drängen sich hinter den Dingen im Dunkel durch. Und der tiefe Wert von jedem ist nicht seine Farbe im Licht, sondern das Gefühl, daß es aus den Dunkelheiten und Geheimnissen kommt, aus denen wir alle leben. Und jedesmal, wenn in dem Klange des Gesprächs das Nichtgemeinsame bemerkbar wurde, ging irgendwo ein Ausblick auf auf helle Hintergründe tiefer Einigkeit.⁴

These two passages, put in their inverse chronological order, show the canvas upon which the version to Sofia Schill was embroidered. It also

¹ Du Bos, *op. cit.*, p. 288, 'a violent voice'.

² *Ibid.*, p. 288.

³ Betz, *op. cit.*, p. 158; the omission marks are not mine.

⁴ *B.u.T.*, p. 41; the italics are Rilke's.

illustrates a marked characteristic of Rilke's letters which partly accounts for the difference in atmosphere of the oral and written descriptions of the visit to Tolstoy. Rarely indeed, although then with supreme effect, did Rilke write naturally, directly, simply and vividly to his friends. He preferred the abstract to the concrete, poetry to prose. The interesting (and lofty) topics of conversation were muffled up in the letter and hustled into the region of darkness and mysteries. Rilke's inadequate knowledge of Russian was camouflaged behind the supposedly esoteric nature of Tolstoy's utterances. The differences of outlook, grandiloquently transfigured into a shadowy 'something' not held in common, demanded their part of that protective colouring with which Rilke enveloped the disturbing visit to Yasnaya Polyana. He could not bring himself to acknowledge openly that the grand, terrible, almost demoniacal old man was not the benignant being whom he had dreamt of approaching like a son. The only revenge Rilke took on Tolstoy for refusing to play a paternal part was to represent himself as no longer wishing to remain under the might of Tolstoy's fatherhood. He used the word *Gewalt* which also means violence, and expressed in that one ambiguous term his shrinking horror at the sight and the sound of an elemental Russian in an elemental rage, a horror so profound that it took him twenty-five years to overcome it. There was another painful aspect of the situation which he did not care to face. He had made so little impression on Tolstoy in Moscow that the latter did not recognize him in Yasnaya Polyana. Worse still, he was probably all too well aware that, even during the walk through the park, Tolstoy was still unconscious of his personality, and had no idea that he was a poet. Shortly before his death the Russian denied that he had ever met the young man who had gone through so much to achieve that humiliating encounter. Lou and Rilke were merely a maddening interruption to an urgent succession of family scenes, which their presence probably brought to a climax. The whole *ménage* was only anxious that they should be off. Not an easy thing to acknowledge, especially when bound up with the shock of disillusion and the pain of blighted hopes. There is therefore at least as much sensitiveness as magnanimity in Rilke's reticence about the cruelly negligent fashion in which he and Lou were treated by the sublime old man, whose horror and weariness of such visitors could not be controlled that day.

As was but to be expected, Rilke regaled his friends with glowing accounts of Russia and Tolstoy when he got back to Germany. He mentioned such descriptions several times in his diary, and everyone who

knew Rilke at all well knew about the visit to Yasnaya Polyana both then and during the rest of his life. But the allusions to Tolstoy in the published correspondence are scarce, particularly to his books. Rilke read *What is Art?* some time before going to Russia, and deprecated it greatly. He also read *The Cossacks* in Russian, *Resurrection* in German, the latter in 1900, and began *War and Peace* in Russian in April of the same year, that is to say before the visit to Yasnaya Polyana. He may or may not have finished it; he never referred to it again. In July 1904 he said that he was spelling out Tolstoy's essay on war in Swedish (he was then in Sweden); and that it impressed him as 'touching, great and helpless; full of the obvious; but the obvious has never yet convinced the masses, their supporters or their leaders'.¹

The next time that Tolstoy's name was mentioned in Rilke's letters was on the occasion of the Russian's sensational death, when Rilke, who was on the eve of a voyage to Africa, wrote to his wife that he could think of nothing but this tragedy. He had been rather wilfully unreal about Tolstoy in 1900 to hide his disappointment, and also because he was then too young and immature to understand the full significance of that gigantic genius. Realization was now coming to him gradually, and with it a fuller comprehension of the irreconcilable difference between them. The short but pregnant passage in the letter to his wife shows an intellectual grasp of Tolstoy's destiny which was beyond him in 1900. He spoke of his ambitious attitude to truth; and of the way he had forced life time and again to be the barometer of his soul; adding that the colossal pressure thus induced had driven the fluid column of his actions far beyond the scale of conscience, where no readings could be taken.²

The same note of great admiration and dispassionate comprehension was struck again in 1913 about the publication of Tolstoy's correspondence with the Countess Alexandrina Solstaya:

...die Gestalt Tolstois ergibt sich aus diesen Blättern unmittelbar, ruhrender, als ich sie je einsah; was die persönliche Berührung mit ihm vermittelte, sein Nichtanders-können, sein Im-Recht-Sein hinter allem Irrtum, dies alles, was mich damals so völlig ergriff, strömt von diesen Seiten, mit der natürlichen Wärme des muhvoll und freudig Lebendigen, unüberhitzt, auf einen über...³

And again, even more emphatically in 1914, of the same book and to the same friend:

Ist der Gerechte, wie ich es verstehe, dieser fast voreilig ans Hiesige verbrauchte Heilge, so konnte Tolstoi als besonders deutliches Beispiel einer solchen Erscheinung

¹ R. M. Rilke, *Briefe aus den Jahren 1902-6*, Leipzig, 1930, p. 203; letter to Clara Rilke from Sweden.

² R. M. Rilke, *Briefe aus den Jahren, 1907-14*, Leipzig, 1933, p. 115; letter to Clara Rilke in 1910 from Paris.

³ *B.* 1907-14, p. 299; to Eva Cassirer from Munich in 1913.

gelten—und doch. stand man ihm gegenüber (ich sah ihn in viel Ruhe 1899 in Moskau, das Jahr darauf an einem unvergeßlichen Frühlingstag auf seinem Gute—), stand man ihm gegenüber—: ich zweifle, ob ich es vermag, Ihnen hinreichend zu versichern, wie sehr dann aus seinem Wesen heraus das andere überwog, das reine, das engelische Rechthaben, das der Zeit nicht achtet und durch sie durch hinüberstrahlt, sie ein für allemal überholend.¹

This handsome tribute to Tolstoy's extraordinary personality pales beside the fine description of him as the poet of death to be found in that famous letter about God and death written during the last war. Rilke had obviously been reading Tolstoy at the time, as the passage (which is too long to quote in full) shows. The conclusion seems to combine memories of Toledo and El Greco's pictures with the remoter recollection of a strange spring walk in formidable company:

Dieser Mensch hat an sich und an anderen viele Arten von Todesangst beobachtet, denn auch noch seiner eigenen Furcht Beobachter zu sein, war ihm durch seine natürliche Fassung gegeben, und sein Verhältnis zum Tode wird bis zuletzt eine großartig durchdrungene Angst gewesen sein, eine Fuge von Angst gleichsam, ein riesiger Bau, ein Angst-turm mit Gängen und Treppen und gellenderen Vorsprüngen und Abstürzen nach allen Seiten — nur, daß die Kraft, mit der er auch noch den Aufwand seiner Angst erfuhr und zugab, im letzten Augenblick, vielleicht, wer weiß es, in unnahbare Wirklichkeit umschlug, plötzlich dieses Turmes sicherer Boden, Landschaft und Himmel war und der Wind und ein Flug Vogel um ihn —.²

This was not the last word however. On 26 February 1924, two years before his death, in answer to a question about writers who had influenced him, Rilke did full and meticulous justice to Russia and his Russian journeys, enumerating Turgenev, Pushkin, Lermontov, Nekrasov and Fyot as writers of personal importance to him, but saying nothing about Tolstoy. Later in the year, approached with a definite *questionnaire* by Hermann Pongs, he rather emphatically denied that Tolstoy had influenced him at all, beyond confirming his emotional discovery of Russia. It was the literal truth; although when he went on to say that Tolstoy had embodied for him in 1900 the tragic destiny of one who had totally misunderstood his task in life, this was a retrospective conception of the man whose gigantic stature and problematical nature were revealed to Rilke gradually with the passing of the years. And alas, there was a sting in the tail of one of those endless sentences which wind their serpentine way through so many of Rilke's letters:

Die Begegnung mit Tolstoi (dessen moralische und religiöse Naivitäten keinerlei Anziehung auf mich ausübten, — kurz vor meiner zweiten Reise hatte ich die schmahliche und torichte Broschüre 'Was ist Kunst?' zu allem Überfluß in die Hände bekommen) bestärkte so in mir genau das Gegenteil von dem, worauf er es bei seinen Besuchern mochte angelegt haben: unendlich entfernt, seiner willkürlichen Absage recht zu geben, hatte ich, bis in sein unwillkürlichstes Benehmen hinein, den Künstler die heimliche Oberhand behalten sehen, und gerade angesichts seines von Weigerungen

¹ B. 1907-14, p. 326; to Eva Cassirer from Paris in 1914.

² R. M. Rilke, *Briefe aus den Jahren 1914-21*, Leipzig, 1937, p. 93; to L.H. from Munich in November 1915.

erfüllten Lebens, steigerte sich in meinem Innern die Vorstellung von dem Rechthaben der künstlerischen Eingebung und Leistung; von ihrer Macht und Gesetzlichkeit; von der schweren Herrlichkeit, zu dergleichen berufen zu sein.¹

It was certainly a manifestation of the artistic temperament at its most unbridled which had made the day at Yasnaya Polyana forever unforgettable to Rilke, but where had the reverence vanished with which the young man had so tremulously regarded it? And where had the mystical consciousness gone of that deep concord between Tolstoy and himself in spite of those things 'not shared in common'? The whole passage bears the stamp of long-delayed resentment, which is particularly striking since there is no other sign of this emotion in Rilke's spoken and written comments on Tolstoy. This sharp little stab of spite is almost Heinesque, and would surprise no one if it had come from him. For amongst the many failings of that desperately vulnerable character, Heine's malignancy as a foe, his merciless repayment of the slightest score, stand out starkly. Whereas Rilke's apparent meekness, his incapacity to feel anger under whatever provocation, have been stressed and interpreted both favourably and unfavourably to the poet time and again. There is however proof in his letters and in his works that this mildness was misleading. He certainly rarely showed anger; but he was capable of harbouring bitter grudges over a very long number of years. The attack on Tolstoy is not an isolated instance of this capacity. Nevertheless, in so gentle a nature it is hardly more surprising than the softened feelings later expressed about Goethe by the notoriously vindictive Heine.

Both poets had undergone the unnerving experience of meeting the supreme genius of their times and of being found wanting in that inexorable balance. Both had been treated arrogantly, and neither had made the slightest impression on their chosen deities, who ignored their offerings of first fruits, and remained indifferent to their presence. Heine was too clear-sighted not to realize what had happened. He resented it bitterly. Rilke refused to acknowledge the truth, and continued to swing the censor. Completer understanding came to both of them gradually, easing the hurt pride of the one by illuminating the nature of Olympianism, vexing the mind of the other by stressing the unresolved discord between the spirit of life and art. The vision of Olympianism remained one of Heine's greatest experiences and inspired some of his finest pages. The revelation of the tormented soul of Tolstoy bore no poetical fruit.

E. M. BUTLER.

MANCHESTER.

¹ Letter to H. Pongs in *Dichtung und Volkstum*, Stuttgart, 1936; dated from Muzot 21 October 1924.

THE NEW VOLUME OF RILKE'S LETTERS

THE publication of the collected edition of Rilke's letters was spread over a period of eight years, 1929-37. In 1939 the first four volumes, covering the time up to August 1914, were beginning to go out of print and a new edition in three volumes for these years was issued to take their place. Careful comparison shows that the difference between these two editions is much greater than at first appears or than the publishers themselves indicate. The original four volumes, referred to in these pages as AI, AII, AIII, AIV, are, in the order of their first appearance:

AII, *Briefe aus den Jahren* 1902-6, published 1929-30.

AIII, *Briefe aus den Jahren* 1906-7, published 1930.

AI, *Briefe und Tagebucher aus der Fruhzeit*, 1899-1902, published 1931.

AIV, *Briefe aus den Jahren* 1907-14, published 1933.

The three new volumes, all published 1939, and referred to below as BI, BII, BIII, are:

BI, *Briefe aus den Jahren* 1892-1904.

BII, *Briefe aus den Jahren* 1904-7.

BIII, *Briefe aus den Jahren* 1907-14.

The two volumes for the remaining years of Rilke's life, 1914-21 and (*Briefe aus Muzot*) 1921-6, and also the volume 'Briefe an seinen Verleger' have not been re-edited and the publishers say that they will not be for some time to come. They will therefore not be considered in these pages. It is however perhaps not superfluous to mention that the collected edition, both in its original and in its present form, is in no sense complete and makes no claim to be so. It is only a comparatively small selection. Rilke was a very prolific letter-writer and it is safe to say that a complete edition of his letters would occupy at least twenty-five volumes of the present size, probably indeed far more. The editors have had to collect, copy and arrange several thousands of letters. This alone rendered their task far more exacting than that of editing D. H. Lawrence's correspondence can have been. The critic should realize this, if he is not to make unreasonable demands upon them.

The difference in mere bulk between the four original and the three new volumes up to August 1914 is not considerable. The type and general make-up is the same, but the new volumes contain on an average about 70 pages more than the old. The result is that the three new volumes contain only about 160 fewer pages than the original four-volume issue.

This means that in simple bulk the new issue is not quite one-ninth smaller than the old one, which had about 1490 pages of text. Examination shows, however, that approximately 340 pages of the new edition are occupied by material which was not represented in the original four volumes. To make room for this new material the same number of pages in the original edition had to be cancelled. Thus rather more than a further two-ninths of the old text has been sacrificed. The new edition takes over therefore a little less than two-thirds of the original text, roughly speaking 990 pages. One rather under- than overestimates the total bulk of cancelled material at 500 pages. It is of interest to the student of Rilke to know exactly what he loses and what he gains by confining himself to one edition or the other. It will appear below that strictly speaking one cannot afford to dispense with either edition; a conclusion more satisfying to the bookseller than to anybody else concerned. It is further of interest to determine what principles may have guided the editors in their treatment of the material. There is no official statement on this point, as the new volumes, unlike the old, are not provided with any editorial 'Vorwort' or 'Nachwort'; the indirect evidence is however ample and conclusive.

The cancellations and additions do not of course affect all seven volumes in the same degree. The greatest variations are to be observed in the earlier years, up to 1907; for the later years the differences are comparatively slight. The following table may give some idea of how matters stand in this respect:

About five-eighths of the text of AI is cancelled (17 letters and the Tagebuch—roughly 250 pages).

About one-third of the text of AII is cancelled (91 letters and passages from 4 letters otherwise adopted—roughly 115 pages).

About three-tenths of the text of AIII is cancelled (78 letters and passages from 4 letters otherwise adopted—roughly 115 pages).

About one-eighteenth of the text of AIV is cancelled (9 letters and 1 passage from a letter otherwise adopted—roughly 20 pages).

About one-half of the text of BI is new (47 letters and material additions to 39 old letters—roughly 226 pages).

About one-seventh of the text of BII is new (11 new letters and material additions to 19 old letters—roughly 60 pages).

About one-seventh of the text of BIII is new (21 new letters—roughly 54 pages).

It will be seen that the quantitative difference between the original and the new volumes for the years 1907-14 (AIV and BIII) is far

slighter than that between the volumes for the preceding period. Almost one-half of the original material for the years up to October 1907 has been cancelled and almost one-third of the material for the same period in the 1939 edition is new.

I. THE CANCELLED MATTER, PRESENT ONLY IN

THE EARLIER EDITION

(a) *Material omitted for the sake of uniformity.* The exclusion of the very important 'Tagebuch' for the time from 3 November 1899 to 22 December 1900 is presumably due to the wish to cover the whole of Rilke's poetical career with a series of volumes of letters and nothing but letters. This is indeed the most serious loss in the new edition and accounts for 215 of the approximately 500 cancelled pages. One can only hope that before long there will be a separate edition of all Rilke's extant 'Tagebücher', including the still more important one of spring 1898, written during and shortly after his stay in Tuscany. It may be noted that the editors have retained in the new volumes one or two things which in strict consistency should have been omitted, since they are no more letters than the 1900 Tagebuch; for example the poem 'Rodin' of 21 November 1902 and the verses sent to Karl von der Heydt on 6 January 1906, 'So will ich gehen, schauender und schlichter ...'. There is, however, one case of occasional verses, which appeared among the letters of the earlier edition, being omitted in the later one; 'Migliera —für Gräfin Manon von Solms-Laubach'. This omission is regrettable, as the poem anticipates one of the main themes of the Duinese Elegies.

(b) *Letters omitted because they are not particularly important.* 195 letters in all are completely omitted in the new edition. Very many of them are not of such interest that one misses them seriously. This applies in particular to the short notes, invitations, greetings and hastily written post-cards, too many of which were included in AII, the first volume to be published, and also to a number of the fragmentary extracts from letters in the same volume. The omissions of this category are simply the fruit of greater editorial experience and should rather be welcomed than regretted. They do not in any way diminish the fulness of thought or impressions, nor is the coherency of the biographical development in any way impaired by them. Where dangers of this sort might have arisen, they are amply counteracted by the new letters in the 1939 edition, which with few exceptions are all to a high degree interesting and important, either from a literary or from a biographical point of view. There remains however a considerable number of omissions which cannot

be justified in this way. In the opinion of the present writer at least 64 of the 195 cancelled letters, i.e. about one-third of them, are of so capital importance for the understanding of Rilke that none of the new ones can be regarded as a fully adequate substitute for them. Other critics might arrive at a slightly smaller or larger figure, there can however be no doubt that at the lowest estimate fifty letters have been excluded on grounds which have nothing whatever to do with deficiency in essential interest.

(c) *Letters omitted which do not show Rilke at his best.* Since about 1932 certain less heroic aspects of Rilke's personality have been more clearly recognized and perhaps excessively insisted on. The earlier volumes of letters published up to this date contained much evidence for the less heroic view of him. It can hardly be a mere chance that much of this evidence vanishes from the edition of 1939. Certain long letters have been omitted which, while very illuminating, and full of Rilke's characteristic genius, are written in a predominatingly querulous tone. They lend colour to the one-sided view of Rilke as an almost morbidly nervous person, eternally dissatisfied with the weather, the climate, the geographical environment and the human society in which he happens to find himself. In the letters in question he comes near to indulging in self-pity, exasperation or an almost egoistic sense of his own exceptional claims and needs. Examples are the letters to Pol de Mont of 10 January 1902, to Julie Weinmann of 25 June 1902, to Clara Rilke of 18 July 1905, and to Grafín Mary Gneisenau of 20 September 1906 and 8 October 1907. It would however be false to suppose that this element of hypersensibility and self-centredness has been completely eliminated in the new edition of the letters. It is expressed not only in some of the letters taken over from the old edition, but also in some of the freshly published ones, especially in a few of those to Lou Andreas-Salomé and Clara Rilke. In the new volumes, however, querulousness no longer occurs anywhere as the sole or dominating tone of a whole letter, but always subordinated to or at least in conjunction with his work and his will to accept the conditions of existence.

(d) *Letters omitted for political reasons.* A considerable number of letters, some of them as valuable as any that he ever wrote, are suppressed for no other recognizable reason than that they happen to be addressed to people whom the present powers in Germany frown upon, for example to Arthur Holitscher, Georg Brandes, Stefan Zweig, Felix Braun, Eva Cassirer, André Gide. Of the seven letters to the publisher S. Fischer and his wife, only one is retained—a business letter to the firm, in which he

declines an offer they had made to him. Furthermore a few letters have been omitted in which Rilke somewhat drastically satirizes the German and Austrian culture of his day. Whether the nudist letter of 7 April 1903 to his wife is omitted for political or other reasons it is hard to decide. It may be noted that the new edition does not omit all his letters to friends of partly non-Aryan extraction, or to people who now for other reasons have become refugees. Not only those to Lou Andreas-Salomé and Hofmannsthal, but also those to Regina Ullmann and Annette Kolb have been retained. Here as in the last discussed case it was evidently a matter rather of toning down the undesirable impression than of eliminating it completely, which would indeed have been impossible.

(e) *Letters omitted in which Rilke talks shop.* Some, though by no means all of the letters are cancelled in which Rilke discusses such questions as the compilation, revision, naming, printing and external get-up of his books, and his relations to the reading public and the critics. Such are for instance the letters to Clara Rilke of 1 and 5 February 1906, to Ellen Key of 6 May 1906 and 27 June 1907, to Axel Juncker of Christmas 1906 and to Friedrich von Oppeln-Bronikowski of 29 March 1907. It is possible that the earlier edition contained a little too much material of this sort for the general reader; the serious student of Rilke however will hardly be able to get on without it.

(f) *Passages omitted from letters otherwise adopted.* As will be shown below, it is one of the most easily recognizable and consistently employed editorial principles of the new volumes, as opposed to the old, to give as far as possible only complete, unabridged letters. It is all the more remarkable that on some occasions this principle is set on one side, passages being omitted from letters taken over from the earlier volumes. This indeed occurs very seldom. The present writer noted only nine cases of material abridgements among the 424 letters common to both editions. There may of course be one or two more. These cases are specially interesting for the light they throw on the general point of view from which the new volumes were edited. The most striking case is that of the letter Rilke wrote to his wife from Viareggio on 24 March 1903, shortly before the composition of the third part of the *Stundenbuch*. From this letter, to which by the way 12 lines have been added at the beginning, no fewer than seven passages of 121 lines in all have been omitted. A glance at these passages confirms the suggestions made above as to the reason for some of the omissions of entire letters. They are nearly all of them expressions of irritation, very amusing in themselves, at the other foreigners who have the insolence to go to Italy at a time when Rilke wants it to

himself; but the most biting attacks are reserved for the 'deutschen Personen' and the 'alten Ekel aus England'. Of the cancelled passages in the eight other abridged letters, two are concerned with Rilke's acquaintance with Stefan Zweig (5 January 1907 to Gudrun von Uexkull, 9 February 1907 to Ellen Key); one is concerned with his friendship with the publisher S. Fischer (21 June 1907 to Clara Rilke); one is a lamentation about his nerves, his headaches and the Roman climate (9 May 1904 to Ellen Key¹); one is a complaint about the 'gute Gemeinschaft' in which he lives in Capri and which seduces him to 'gesprächsweisen Ausgaben, deren Manko sich in der Arbeit fühlbar macht' (10 February 1907 to E. von der Heydt). The omissions from the letters to Clara Rilke of 17 April 1903 and 16 July 1905 are of no particular importance. The seven lines omitted at the end of the letter to her of 7 November 1907 are an expression of personal tenderness and can best be spoken of in the following section. They are the only case of material alteration of the text of an adopted letter in the new volumes for the years 1907-14. This volume represents in several ways a departure from the new principles carried into practice in those for the years 1892-1907. Thus it retains references to Stefan Zweig, Beer-Hofmann, Freud, and Steindorff, and of the four references to Werfel only one—quite a friendly one as it happens—disappears, because it is in a letter to Eva Cassirer. If the method of the two previous volumes had been strictly adhered to, presumably all these allusions would have been got rid of. There is even one new letter (23 February 1914) in praise of Proust. On the other hand, the name of the suspect Graf Kessler, which occurs in full in the earlier edition and presumably also in Rilke's own text, has been replaced by a non-committal 'K.' in the letters to Clara Rilke of 2 March 1910 and to the Fürstin von Thurn und Taxis-Hohenlohe of 17 April 1913, so that one at first tends to suppose that the reference is to Kassner. Similarly Martin Buber's name is deleted from the note on Letter No. 50.

II. THE NEW MATERIAL, PRESENT ONLY IN THE LATER EDITION

(a) *Passages added to the adopted letters.* The text of a large number of letters has been supplemented, especially of those for the period from July 1902 to May 1906, that is to say of the first volume to be published,

¹ The original short extract from this letter in A II has been completely suppressed in B I and its place is taken by another extract. If it were not for the date and the name of the person addressed, it would be impossible to recognize that both passages represent one and the same letter. It remains uncertain whether the two extracts together constitute the complete text of the letter or not. In addition to this letter and the one of March 1903 mentioned above, two others are abridged at one point and supplemented at other points in the new edition, so that their complete texts can only be reconstructed by a comparison of both versions (7 April 1903 and 16 July 1903 both to Clara Rilke).

only four years after Rilke's death. It was the avowed principle of the editors then, at the beginning of their task, to omit everything, 'was unmittelbar die Beziehung zwischen Briefschreiber und Empfänger ausdrückt'. The result is, that scarcely a single one of the letters in AII is really complete; even those which are otherwise substantially so have been deprived of their opening and concluding words, and a considerable number are represented only by short excerpts. As one volume succeeded another this principle was gradually abandoned; the idea of a collection of extracts from letters gave way to that of a collection of complete letters. By the time the third volume (AI) appeared, this new principle was almost fully established, and for the following three volumes up to Rilke's death the complete letter remained the norm. The volumes AII and AIII with their fragmentary character did not therefore fit consistently in with the rest of the whole series as it was available up to 1939. It was one of the chief objects of the editors, in preparing a new issue of the letters for this period, to impose on them uniformly the principle of completeness and so bring them in line with the other volumes. The opening and closing words had to be added, the fragments had either to be sacrificed altogether or, if they proved particularly valuable, they had to be supplemented with the rest of the text in question. This would seem to have been the general principle. That it could not be carried out with complete consistency has been shown already in the previous section. But not only was the earlier text of a few letters abridged for political and other reasons; a number of the old excerpts, especially from the letters to Clara Rilke, were taken over in the original fragmentary state. On the whole however the principle of the complete letter was enforced. This entailed very numerous additions to the text, most of them too minute or immaterial to be of general interest. The chief problem was presented by Rilke's letters to his wife, in connexion with which a curious vacillation can be observed both in the earlier and in the later editions. AII and AIII (1902-7) delete all personal expressions of affection in these letters, such as 'Lass es gut sein um Dich und in Dir' or 'Liebes zu Deinem Sonntag'. AI and AIV include a great number of such expressions. The 1939 edition almost exactly reverses this state of affairs. Very many expressions of personal affection are restored to the letters to Clara Rilke up to 18 May 1906, with which volume AII concludes; for example the last words of this very letter: 'Wenn Du unser kleines Mädchen siehst, küß sie von mir.' From this point onwards however nearly all such expressions are suppressed. This makes no difference to the text of the letters to Clara Rilke from May 1906 to 25 October 1907, as

these had in volume AIII in any case already been deprived of all such expressions; so far as this point is concerned, BII reproduces the earlier text without deviations; only in one letter (18 February 1907) in which AIII had inadvertently allowed the endearment 'Liebe' to stand, BII cancels it. In the letters from 26 October 1907 to August 1914, on the other hand, it is the earlier edition which contains a large number of endearing words and the signature 'Dem Rainer Maria', while the later edition deletes them. The only material passage omitted from a letter in this new volume is the seven lines referred to in the last section, in which Rilke writes to his wife on 7 November 1907 among other things: 'Wie gut Du alles das fühlst und sagst. Du Liebe, die nicht voreilig fühlt; die erst fühlt, wenn das Gefühl reif geworden ist. Du glaubst nicht, wie gut das war in der Nacht endlich allein Dich alles das denken und fühlen und glauben zu wissen.' Apart from this one case, BIII does not materially add to or shorten the text of any of the letters as they stand in AIV. Additions to the letters of those years are in any case out of the question, since they are evidently with few exceptions given in extenso already in the first edition.

The additions to about fifty-eight of the adopted letters in BI and BII are worthy of special attention, both because of their length and because of their contents. Only three of these materially supplemented letters are taken over from AI, only four from AIII; the other fifty-one are all from the very fragmentary older volume for the years 1902-6. The most noteworthy case is that of the long letter to Lou Andreas-Salomé of 12 May 1904. Even in the earlier edition this letter had occupied 16 pages. The supplementary passages cover no fewer than another 11 pages. There are however many other cases which, while less striking, are no less important. It is, for example, worth a great deal to see the often quoted words on Goethe to Tora Holmström of 3 August 1904 in their full context.

(b) *The new letters considered in general.* Of the seventy-nine new letters in the 1939 volumes at least seven have, according to the notes, been printed before in periodicals. They are nos. 3 and 31 in BI, nos. 21 and 196 in BII, nos 121, 142 and 146 in BIII. The remaining seventy-two are apparently printed for the first time in the present edition. As was stated above, they are with hardly any exceptions all of the highest interest and value. The majority of them did not presumably come into the hands of the editors until after the publication of the earlier volumes.

(c) *Light thrown on otherwise little known stages in Rilke's life by the new letters.* Whereas the old edition of the letters began with the winter of

1899–1900, that is to say, about the time of Rilke's twenty-fourth birthday, the point of departure of the new one is seven years earlier and no fewer than thirty of the new letters belong to those critical years of his development. Two from the end of 1892 show him at the age of seventeen, and from October 1895 onwards,—that is to say, from the time of his decisive move to Munich—the series of published letters proceeds without serious gaps down to the last weeks before his death. This is a great gain. A minor gap of four months still remains at the beginning of 1905, and the years 1908 to 1911 are numerically still more thinly represented than any others of his life after 1899. One of the new letters however (23 October 1909 to Lou Andreas-Salomé) throws valuable light on his journey to Provence of autumn 1909, and another (27 June 1911 to Fräulein Baumgärtner) does the same for his stay in Egypt.

(d) *Fresh light thrown on Rilke's human relationships by the new letters.* It is specially interesting to see on what terms Rilke stood with such distinguished contemporaries as Richard Dehmel, Stefan George, Tolstoi, Friedrich Huch, Gerhart Hauptmann and Reinhard Johannes Sorge; also with the now forgotten Richard Zoosmann, who had a considerable reputation in the nineties. It is also a great advantage to have his three letters to Gräfin Luise Schwerin, who first made him acquainted with Meister Eckhart and whose death made so deep an impression on him, determining perhaps more than any other single experience his later conceptions of the dead. There is a letter to his mother, the second to be published anywhere at full length, which is very illuminating. It was written shortly after his father's death and shows that not even this great common bereavement could span the estrangement between mother and son.

(e) *Fresh light thrown on Rilke's biography and conduct by the new letters.* In this connexion his letters to his early publisher Kattentidt are specially interesting. The date of his marriage (29 April 1901) is made known; and the stages by which it gradually ceased to be a reality can be more clearly recognized. The detailed retrospect on his childhood in the letter of 3 April 1903 to Ellen Key is particularly valuable, especially for the light it throws on his attitude towards his home life and his school-days. The curious vacillation between credulity and scepticism in his dealings with spiritualism and the occult becomes a little more intelligible when one observes the earlier stages of it in his important letters to Bauschinger and Du Prel (1895 and 1897). It is interesting to see how Rilke, who later was to declare 'dass mein Auge auf Kreise nicht eingestellt ist: ich sehe sie nicht, so sehr bin ich davon erfüllt, dass es sich

immer und  berall um die einzelnen handelt' (to Stefan Zweig, 3 August 1907), addresses ten years earlier an appeal to Du Prel, 'einer von den Verb ndeten des neuen Glaubens zu werden' (16 February 1897) and ten months afterwards expresses to Stefan George a similar desire for enrolment in a group: 'Dem engeren, von den Mitgliedern erkorenen Leserkreis der Bl tter f r die Kunst anzugeh ren, ist der Vorzug, welchen von Ihnen erbittet Rainer Maria Rilke' (7 December 1897). Of all Rilke's letters few are so brilliant, charming or many-sided as those to Friedrich Huch, which appear for the first time in the 1939 volumes. They display in epitome nearly all his extraordinary qualities as an artist, a man, a thinker and a critic.

(f) *Fresh light thrown on Rilke's Weltanschauung by the new letters.* The letter of 29 April 1904 to his brother-in-law expounds Rilke's curious doctrine of love without possession from a new angle and contains some interesting suggestions as to its practical application. The letter of 21 October 1907 is a very interesting and characteristic attempt to take the sting out of the ancient ethical problems of conscience and duty with a charm of sweet words. The answers to Ellen Key's *questionnaire* (2 April 1904) are very elucidatory.

III. THE STANDARD OF TEXTUAL ACCURACY IN THE TWO EDITIONS

The new volumes are separated from the earliest of the old ones by nearly ten years of editorial experience. One of the fruits of this experience is a remarkable increase in textual accuracy, secured at the expense of much painstaking labour and skill. The division into paragraphs has often been modified, presumably always after consultation of the originals. Three letters which had not been quite correctly placed, because they are not fully dated, have been transferred to their proper position (no. 44 of B I, no. 69 of B II, no. 95 of B III). Printer's errors and errors of transcription in the older edition have been corrected: e.g. 'den Tag' instead of 'dem Tage' in the verse-letter to Paula Becker of 6 November 1900, and 'Belgien' instead of 'Berlin' in the letter also addressed to her of 17 March 1907. Underlinings of words are indicated in the new editions where there is no sign of them on the older ones. One or two of Rilke's peculiar spellings are introduced where they had been normalized in the earlier volumes, e.g. 'muhs lig' and 'unst t'. Two of Rilke's own footnotes, which had been introduced into the main text of the letter in question, are printed as footnotes this time (23 February 1900 to Sofia Schill and 27 March 1903 to Clara Rilke). Wherever the deviations between the two editions can be checked, it turns out that the

later one is the more accurate; it seems therefore safe to rely on it also in the other cases, even when the linguistically correct 'Il faut que je me remette' in the letter of 18 May 1914 to the Fürstin is replaced by 'Il faut que je me remets', which Rilke may quite conceivably have written. A few inaccuracies still remain indeed in the notes. The 'Fragment von den Einsamen' referred to in the letter to Clara Rilke of 13 October 1907 is not lost, as the notes of both editions suggest. It is in the Rilke Archiv, and the words from it which Rilke himself alludes to are quoted in the present writer's book *Lebenshaltung und Symbolik bei R. M. Rilke* on p. xvi of the Introduction. Kassner's book, which Rilke alludes to as an 'ältere Schrift' on 7 February 1912, is indeed the germ of *Der indische Gedanke*, published at Leipzig in 1913; but it is not the same book. The book Rilke means is called *Der indische Idealismus* and was published in Munich about 1902. The poem 'Maria Himmelfahrt', sent to Lou Andreas-Salomé on 19 December 1912, was indeed still 'ungedruckt' when the letters for 1907-14 were first published in 1933, but it has since been printed at least once, in the *Späte Gedichte* of 1934. The misleading reference to the first Duinese Elegy '*in der ersten Fassung*' is still retained in one of the notes; it appears that only one version is known to exist, that of the final text as published in 1923. Such slips are however trifling and inevitable in view of the magnitude of the undertaking. There are, as has been shown above, several points about both editions to which the reader might fairly take exception, especially if he happens not to be resident in Germany at the present time. Such dissatisfaction must however give way to gratitude and admiration, when one considers how immense are the demands for patience, industry, skill and tact inherent in the task of editing the correspondence of such a man as Rilke so soon after his death, and how very much the difficulties of this task are complicated by the present political system in Germany. This work has not been performed by unconcerned professional editors, but by members of Rilke's own family, who have had to train themselves for it, and have succeeded in doing so to such a degree that one could not wish that the work had been left to an outsider, or imagine that anyone else would, under the exceptionally difficult circumstances, have done it better.

EUDO C. MASON.

BASLE.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

NOTES ON HENRY PORTER

Apart from references in Henslowe's diary, there is very little material from which the Porter canon can be reconstructed. Henslowe's entries are vague, and Porter's connexion with three plays bearing similar titles, *The Two Angry Women of Abington* (Part I and Part II) and *The Two Merry Women of Abington*, is a further source of confusion. These notes are an attempt to reduce the chaos to some kind of order.

(1) Porter's only extant play, *The Two Angry Women of Abington*, exists in two distinct quarto editions, both published in 1599. Professor J. L. Hotson ('The Adventure of a Single Rapier', *Atlantic Monthly*, July 1931) has produced evidence to show that Porter was mortally wounded in a duel with John Daye on 6 June 1599 and died on the following day. It is therefore possible that both quartos are posthumous. Both are full of inaccuracies, but the text they give is certainly a good one, as is shown by its length (3037 lines).

(2) That this play was written and performed at least ten years before the publication of the quartos is shown by a reference in Harvey's *Plaine Percevall* in 1589:

yet I will nicke name no bodie: I am none of these traft mockado mak-a-dooes: for
'Qui mochat, moccabitur' quoth the servingman of Abingdon.

Cf. Porter, ll. 888-90:

And it seemeth unto me, I it seemes to me, that you maister *Phillip* mocke me, do
you not know *qui mocat mocabitur*, mocke age and se how it will prosper?

H. C. Hart, who first pointed out this reference (3 *Henry VI*, Arden Edition, Introduction), suggested that Shakespeare was indebted to this play and cites a parallel between 3 *Henry VI*, v, v, 25-6:

Let Aesop fable in a winter's night;
His currish riddles sort not with this place.

and Porter, ll. 150-1:

Wel mistresse, wel, I have red *Aesops* fables,
And know your morral meaning well ynough. (moralls in Qs.)

It is worth noting that nowhere else does Shakespeare mention Aesop. Presumably Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, III, v, 141,

I would the fool were married to her grave,

borrows from Porter, l. 1628,

He rather have her married to her grave.

The author of *Arden of Feversham* may be indebted to Porter for a passage on tailors' apprentices (Porter, ll. 1783-92) and also for an Aesop reference, though references to Aesop, common enough in Nashe, have little significance. There is, however, good internal and external evidence for dating the play before 1589.

(3) Porter's identity has not yet been established, but it is now obvious that he was not the Henry Porter of Brasenose who matriculated in 1589, at the age of sixteen. Nor, on Hotson's showing, could he have been the Christ Church Bachelor of Music of 1600, the Royal Sackbut of 1603, or the Gentleman of Chapel Royal of 1616. This leaves only the Henry Porter who was the subject of Weever's epigram in 1599.¹ Weever's lines,

Thy silver bell could not so sweetly sing
If that too soon thou hadst begun her ring,

do not necessarily prove that he was addressing a musician: 'silver bell' expresses admirably the music of Porter's verse, and might conceivably have been suggested by a striking reference to bells in the extant play. Even so, it is not certain that this was the man: Henry Porter is not, after all, an uncommon name, and the only clue that the poet himself gives is that he was a 'gentleman'.

(4) The quartos state that the play had been 'lately playde by the right Honorable the Earle of Nottingham, Lord high Admirall, his servants', and as Henslowe records the completed payment for the second part of *The Two Angry Women of Abington* on 12 February 1598(9) we may assume a propinquity of performances. Henslowe's entries are relevant:

- (1) Lent vnto thomas dowton the 22 of desembz 1598 to bye a boooke of harey poorter called the 2 pte of the 2 angrey women of abengton.... ..v¹¹
- (2) Lent vnto Thomas dowton the 31 of Janewary 1598^[9] to bye tafetie for ij womones gownes for the ij angrey women of abengton the some ofix¹¹
- (3) Lent vnto Thomas dowton the 12 of feberye 1598^[9] to pay m^r poorter in fulle payment for his boooke called the 2 pte of the angry women of abington the some ofij¹¹
- (4) Lent vnto Thomas dowton the 12 of february 1598^[9] to by divers thinges for the playe called the 2 pte of the angrey women of abingtonij¹¹

It is usually assumed that all these payments were for the second part of *The Two Angry Women of Abington*, but the care with which Henslowe distinguishes '2 pte' in entries (1), (3), and (4), strongly suggests that the second entry refers to the play that has come down to us, and the statement of the title-page of the quartos confirms this.

¹ Rosetta E. Shear, *New Facts about Henry Porter*, P.M.L.A., XLII, 1927, 641-55, furnishes a mass of new details about various Henry Porters, but her speculations regarding the dramatist's identity are not very convincing.

That the quartos are of the first part of the play is certain. Apart from Harvey's reference, this play can hardly have been a sequel, but that the author contemplated the writing of a sequel is clear from the epilogue,

If this be bad, he promises a better
Trust him, and he will proove a right true debter,

which may have been added for the 1599 performance. The promise of a sequel is also held out in ll. 2241-2, where Frank Goursey says to Philp,

Good Lord what you would doe,
Well we shall see one day how you can woe.

For a play of 1589 or thereabouts, *The Two Angry Women* is very long. Its 3037 lines contain, moreover, a good deal of prose. It may therefore seem possible that the text of the quartos represents a combination of acting versions of the two parts, but this is most unlikely, for there is no evidence of a break, and the plot is ineluctably and indisputably that of a single play. Whether the play originally bore its present title we cannot say, but there is no reason to assume otherwise. The titles of Porter's other known plays hardly fit, and it is only necessary to read the play to see the ludicrous impossibility of Fleay's suggestion that it is its author's *Love Prevented* of 1598, renamed.

(5) Henslowe's subsequent entry concerning a third Abingdon play raises a problem. The entry reads:

Lent vnto harey porter at the Requeste of the company in earneste of his
of abenton
boocke called ij mery wemen the some of fortyshellings for the Résayte of that
money he gaue me his faythfulle promysse that J shold haue alle the boockes
w^{ch} he writte ether him selfe or wth any other w^{ch} some was dd (vpon) the
28 of february 1598 J saye.....thomas downton Robart shawe xxxx^s

Dr W. W. Greg, in the introduction to the Malone Society reprint, suggests that *The Two Merry Women* was probably only an excuse for borrowing money. Collier's view was that this play and the second part of *The Two Angry Women* were identical, but there are difficulties. Nevertheless, one imagines that two plays must have sufficed to exhaust the possibilities of the two ladies of Abingdon, and that a third play about them is unlikely. There is no first-rate testimony that this play really belonged to the Abingdon set. The authenticity of the interpolated 'of abenton' has never, so far as I know, been questioned, but it is, in any case, an obvious afterthought, and here Henslowe may easily have followed the example of the divinity student who correctly named Saul as King of Israel, and brightly added 'afterwards called Paul'. Whether or not Porter began this play, he was collaborating with Chettle in *The Spencers* until near the end of March 1599, so that he died probably before his comedy could be completed.

The entry records a transaction which is by no means clear. For a mere two pounds Henslowe received (a) earnest of a play by one of his most successful men, and (b) a monopoly of the dramatist's work. I suggest that (b) is the significant part of the entry. Apparently it represents Henslowe's first contract with a playwright, though he records earlier acting contracts, and it seems that no similar transaction took place until 1602 when, for a loan of three pounds, Chettle's services were secured exclusively for the Admiral's men. Thus a dangerous precedent was established and possibly disguised under cover of a payment, made 'at the Requeste of the company'—not a common phrase for Henslowe—for a play already written and paid for as the second part of *The Two Angry Women* and now restyled *The Two Merry Women*.¹ It is, in any case, natural to assume that in the '2 pte' the women were depicted as merry since a second outbreak of anger would surely involve a mere tedious repetition of the earlier play.

(6) The establishment of Porter's extant play as a work of the 1580's increases its literary importance (already high) and opens up new possibilities. In the first place, his hand may be sought in any of the anonymous plays of ca. 1585-95. Of all Elizabethan dramatic styles Porter's is, with the exception of Marlowe's and Shakespeare's, the most personal, and if it exists in any of these plays it should not be hard to identify. The main verse determinants are regular blank verse freely breaking into couplet, frequent use of identical rhyme, and sporadic use of tetrameter.

Secondly, there is the possibility of Shakespeare's debt to Porter. When we consider how much the young dramatist from Stratford owed to Marlowe, Kyd, Greene and Lodge, it is reasonable to assume that he was equally indebted to Porter. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, with its forest scenes and mistaken identities, may include a few suggestions from *The Two Angry Women of Abington*, and Hart's interesting comparison between the proverb-mongering humour of Richard, Duke of Gloucester in 3 *Henry VI* and that of Nicholas Proverbs in Porter's play deserves serious attention. But there is another play by Shakespeare, written in haste, based, it is assumed, on an earlier play, containing many loose ends and surrendered plots, and comprising elements strikingly similar to Porter's own, such as the jealousy of married couples; a comic character who falls, or is thrown, into the water; inns, games and country customs; a duel with spectators who anticipate some good

¹ I do not know whether such a contract, openly acknowledged, might have involved legal difficulties, but it is certain that the rest of Henslowe's needy hacks would have dunned him for money.

sport, and plot a counter move for the discomfiture of the participants; mistaken identity in the woods at night, with the scenic identity of trees and torches which would be more obvious on a stage than in a printed text. *The Merry Wives of Windsor* bears a number of tempting similarities to Porter's play other than the one implicit in its title. Hart (*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Arden edition)¹ notes several parallels, and there are others. It is clear that the mangled 1602 quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* contains snatches of the earlier play (e.g. the phrase 'metamorphised youth' in Scene XVIII, applied here to Falstaff), whose vocabulary and style suggest that this play, whether or not it was the lost *Jealous Comedy* of 1593, was written in a manner very like that of Henry Porter.

J. M. NOSWORTHY.

GRONINGEN.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SHAKESPEARE'S TIMON

Shakespeare's Timon of Athens, at the loss of his great fortune, changes almost over-night from the merry and generous companion to the bitter misanthrope who wishes only ill to his fellow-men: this is all quite in the tradition of the old Timon story; but this tradition depicts Timon most unsympathetically, whereas Shakespeare makes him a hero too noble for this world, and seems to make his fall express the economic ruin that in Jacobean times was pursuing the old feudal families.² This change in attitude toward Timon required the dramatist to motivate his hero's vitriolic misanthropy to make it less repellent to the reader. Shakespeare does this in part by depicting Timon's loss of fortune as due to his virtuous liberality rather than to wasteful extravagance, by depicting his false friends in the blackest colours and associating his ruin with the current scandal of extortionate usury; and the present study proposes further to suggest that Shakespeare also motivates Timon's change by depicting in his nature a metamorphosis that in Elizabethan popular science would seem the natural result of his misfortunes. Timon's suicide, moreover, the traditional conclusion of the story, presented a similar problem; for, according to Christian doctrine, suicide was a mortal sin; and Shakespeare could excuse it only by showing that it was the inevitable result of Timon's physical and psychological change.

¹ There are some confusions in Hart's references to Porter here. Hart was obviously interested in the possible influence of *The Two Angry Women of Abington* on Shakespeare, but he died before the completion of his edition of *3 Henry VI*, at the very time, it seems, when he first discovered the date of Porter's comedy and apprehended its Shakespearean significance.

² See 'The Theme of Timon of Athens', *M.L.R.*, xxix, 20 *et seq.*

Elizabethan psychological theory was based on the concept of the four 'humours', or fluids, that were thought to govern the bodily and mental functions. The predominance of blood made a man 'sanguine'; and such persons were thought to be particularly fortunate, for they were under the astral influence of the planet Jupiter, 'the greatest fortune',¹ and blood was considered the best of all the humours:² the Timon of Act I, with his host of friends and his 'large fortune',³ certainly seems a lucky man. The sanguine temper, moreover, was appropriate to 'Noblemen',⁴ and 'the Lord Timon', with his wide stretch of landed estates, is clearly an Athenian noble. The bodily attributes of the sanguine type were a 'persuasive' voice and a 'comely' stature;⁵ and Timon would seem to have been a personable man. Such people were 'mery' and witty to their fellows;⁶ and Timon was certainly a jovial companion. In character, they were reckoned 'just, true, benevolent, liberall, faithfull, milde, godly, shamefast, magnanimous . . . and happie';⁷ and the earlier Timon is all these things. Both Timon's own acts at the outset of the play and the comment of the other characters bring out these sanguine traits; and in the first scene he is introduced as 'worthy lord':

A most incomparable man, breathed, as it were,
To an untirable and continuat goodness . . .

He has a 'good and gracious nature';⁸ he 'outgoes the very heart of kindness';⁹ he has 'The noblest mind . . . That ever govern'd man';¹⁰ and even the stranger who never had had 'any of his bounties' attributes to Timon a 'right noble mind, illustrious virtue, And honourable carriage . . .'.¹¹ Shakespeare's hero, therefore, both in conditions of life and in physical and mental character, conforms to the sanguine type; but these 'benevolent, liberall' traits are the very cause of his ruin; and the dramatist, to leave no doubt of his intention, has Flavius declare that Timon's 'humour' makes him give away his wealth;¹² and the latter part of the play reiterates the paradoxical theme that sanguine fortunes, in such a state as Athens, lead only to ruin.¹³ Thus Shakespeare gives to Timon the affluence and the happy, generous nature that should bring good to all, but in this diseased society brings only evil.

In sharp contrast to this sanguine Timon are the sub-major characters

¹ C. Dariot, *Judgement of the Starres*, London, 1598, sig. C 4 v.

² *Batman upon Bartholome*, London, 1582, leaf 30 r.

³ *Timon*, I, i, 58.

⁴ Dariot, *op. cit.*, sig. D 2 v.

⁵ L. Lemnie, *Touchstone of Complexions*, London, 1581, leaf 48 v.

⁶ *Most Excellent Booke of Arcandam*, London, 1592, sig. M 2 r.

⁷ Dariot, *op. cit.*, sig. D 2 v.

⁸ *Timon*, I, i, 59.

⁹ *Ibid.*, I, i, 276-7.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, I, i, 282-3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, III, iii, 79-80.

¹² *Ibid.*, I, ii, 155.

¹³ *Ibid.*, IV, iii *passim*.

of the play. The Senators, despite their position and wealth, lack the liberality of the sanguine humour, and indeed descend to usury.¹ Shakespeare definitely blames this fault upon their physical condition:

These old fellows
Have their ingratitude in them hereditary:
Their blood is caked, 'tis cold, it seldom flows;
'Tis lack of kindly warmth they are not kind...²

This 'cold' disposition, together with their 'dotage',³ suggests that they are supposed to be melancholy. This humour was chill and dry, unlucky and associated with death, in diametric opposition to the warm and damp and vital attributes of the sanguine type. Timon's steward Flavius seems to be actuated by the phlegmatic humour, which was dull but well-intentioned:⁴ Flavius deplores somewhat helplessly his master's prodigality, but does not even get to warn him until it is too late. The churlish Apemantus illustrates the fourth humour, and is certainly choleric: he constantly rails, and is described as 'ever angry'.⁵ This same choleric disposition, which was supposed to be appropriate to military men,⁶ appears also in Timon's friend, the soldier Alcibiades: the sack of Athens that he threatens in revenge for the wrongs that the Senate has committed is closely parallel to the Emperor's despoiling of Milan, likewise in revenge; and this latter event was attributed to choler.⁷ Thus the early and middle scenes of the drama, like *Romeo and Juliet*,⁸ present in sharp dramatic contrast the types of all four humours.

During the second act, Timon suddenly learns from his steward that his lands are 'all engaged, some forfeited and gone'.⁹ This deeply shocks him,¹⁰ and he seeks aid at once from his erstwhile gay companions, but finds them cold. In Act III he invites them to a feast of lukewarm water, insults them, and drives them out with speeches of bitterness and hate so unlike his former self that his guests declare him 'mad'.¹¹ Act IV opens with his bitter soliloquy against the state of Athens and indeed all human society. Timon has entered his second phase; he is no longer of a sanguine temper. His change of fortune, when once he fully realizes it, has put him 'much out of health';¹² he has a 'distracted soul';¹³ and 'nought but humour sways him'.¹⁴ Just which humour this is seems evident from his continued 'chydying',¹⁵ which was associated with the

¹ *Timon*, III, v, 110.

² *Ibid.*, II, ii, 216-17.

³ *Ibid.*, III, v, 99.

⁴ *Batman upon Bartholome*, leaf 32 r.; Lemme, *op. cit.*, leaves 23 v. and 81 r.

⁵ *Timon*, I, ii, 28-29.

⁶ Darriot, *op. cit.*, sig. D 3 r.

⁷ N. Coeffeteau, *Table of Humane Passions*, London, 1621, 582.

⁸ 'Shakespeare's Star Crossed Lovers', *R.E.S.*, xv, 16 *et seq.*

⁹ *Timon*, II, ii, 147.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, III, iv, 79 *et seq.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*, III, vi, 118.

¹² *Ibid.*, III, iv, 70-2.

¹³ *Ibid.*, III, iv, 115.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, III, vi, 111.

¹⁵ Lemme, *op. cit.*, leaf 23 v.

choleric type, and, somewhat later, Timon himself refers to his 'choler'.¹ This humour was supposed to arise, as Timon's did, from overwhelming misfortune² or from the contempt of others, and Timon, fallen on evil days and cast off by his friends, is surely a fit subject. His recurrent 'fury',³ his searing 'hate',⁴ and his 'dangerous nature',⁵ are all quite consonant with choler, which, according to the authorities, was 'angry, prompt of wit, nimble, inconstant...'⁶ Timon was all these things to those of his old friends who visited him in his exile. Choleric men were under the influence of Mars, the 'lesse misfortune';⁷ and the humour is described as the worst of all human tendencies.⁸ Like Timon, they were 'obstinate';⁹ and none were 'worse nor more dangerous'.¹⁰ Thus Shakespeare motivates Timon's change, and gives tragic inevitability to a type of hero who would otherwise be utterly unattractive: choler was a natural consequence of misfortune, and the Elizabethans could no more blame a choleric Timon than they could a crazed King Lear.

Shakespeare still had the task of motivating Timon's final suicide, the traditional conclusion of the story for which there seemed no satisfactory substitute. He does not show this incident upon the stage, and glances over it as rapidly as he can; but, even so, Timon must be given all possible excuse. In the eyes of the law and of widespread public opinion, suicide had but one possible excuse, insanity; and, in trials for *felo de se* before a coroner's jury, this was the one effective plea of heirs who wished to save the dead man's goods from forfeiture to the Crown.¹¹ Shakespeare, therefore, was obliged at least to leave open a possible question of Timon's lunacy: indeed, the misanthrope himself refers to his 'long sickness of health and living';¹² Apemantus calls him 'madman';¹³ Flavius bewails his 'decay and failing';¹⁴ and his friend Alcibiades declares that Timon's 'wits Are drown'd and lost in his calamities'.¹⁵ Timon's is not the madness of actual frenzy, and so would not quite make him legally *non compos*, but he seems to have lost poise at least sufficiently to show yet another significant change in his bodily humour: the heat of choler was thought to dry up the vital fluids, and so brought on the cold and dry condition of 'melancholy' (embittered exasperation) which was a proper prelude to the insanity¹⁶ that Shakespeare must imply for his *finale*. Thus melan-

¹ *Timon*, IV, iii, 364.

² Coeffeteau, *op. cit.*, 580.

³ *Timon*, III, vi, 107

⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, i, *passim*.

⁵ *Ibid.*, IV, iii, 492.

⁶ *Arcandam*, *ed. cit.*, sig. M 2 r.

⁷ Darnot, *op. cit.*, sig. C 4 v.

⁸ Coeffeteau, *op. cit.*, 617 *et seq.*

⁹ T. Hyll, *Contemplation of Mankind*, London, 1571, leaf 8 v.

¹⁰ Coeffeteau, *op. cit.*, 598.

¹¹ See 'Ophelia's Crime of Felo de Se', *W. Va. Law Quart.*, XLII, 228 *et seq.*

¹² *Timon*, V, i, 184-5.

¹³ *Ibid.*, IV, iii, 220.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, iii, 459.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, IV, iii, 88-9.

¹⁶ T. Bright, *Treatise of Melancholy*, London, 1613 (Ded., 1586), Chap. xviii; T. Walking-ton, *Optick Glasse of Humors*, 1639, Chap. xiii.

choly was the logical transition from bitter choleric wrath to the madness that would actuate and excuse the high crime of suicide; and, in the later scenes, considerable evidence points to a melancholy Timon. He himself declares as early as the middle of Act iv. 'I am misanthropos, and hate mankind';¹ Apemantus attributes to him 'A poor unmanly melancholy sprung From change of fortune';² one of the bandits says that his poverty and loss of friends 'drove him into this melancholy',³ and the first Senator announces that 'discontents are unremoveably Coupled to his nature'.⁴

Thus Shakespeare has depicted a psychological evolution in Timon appropriate to his actions in the original story and also to the change in point of view that the dramatist intended: his sanguine nature, through bitter adversity, gives place to the choleric, and this in turn burns out to a bitter melancholy, which possibly runs its course to madness, or at all events concludes with suicide. Thus character and plot are perfectly integrated; and the Elizabethan theory of humours supplies the hero with an inevitable psychological evolution. Just so in a contemporary play, Shakespeare makes Coriolanus begin with military pride, pass on to choler and so to revenge and ruin.⁵ In the comedies, in the figures of Petruchio,⁶ Corporal Nym⁷ and Falstaff, he had depicted men pretending to humours that they did not by right possess; in *Romeo and Juliet*, he had combined the theory of humours with astrology to give motive to the plot; in *Twelfth Night*, the Duke's love-melancholy is used to explain his sudden marriage to Viola at the end;⁸ in *Hamlet*, melancholy is the hero's natural reaction at the frustration of his purposes;⁹ and in *Lear* it appears as incident to the King's old age; but, in his latest tragedies, Shakespeare uses the humours, not incidentally, but as the very warp and woof of plot and character and as the main support to his political or social theme. Coriolanus and Timon, as characters, could not have been what they were, nor could the plays have reasonably followed the course of action that the theme required and that tradition had established, but for the motivating psychology of the humours.

JOHN W. DRAPER.

MORGANTOWN, W. VIRGINIA.

¹ *Timon*, iv, iii, 52.

² *Ibid.*, iv, iii, 297-8.

³ 'Shakespeare's Coriolanus', *W. Va. Phil. Studies*, iii, 1939, 22 *et seq.*

⁴ 'Kate the Curst', *Jour. Nerv. Ment. Disease*, lxxxix, 757 *et seq.*

⁵ See 'The Humor of Corporal Nym', *Bull. Shak. Ass. Amer.*, xiii, 131 *et seq.*

⁶ See 'The Melancholy Duke Orsino', *Bull. Johns Hopk. Inst. Med. Hist.*, vi, 1620 *et seq.*

⁷ See *The 'Hamlet' of Shakespeare's Audience*, Durham (N.C.), 1938, 175 *et seq.*

⁸ *Ibid.*, iv, iii, 202-3.

⁹ *Ibid.* v, ii, 222-3.

A SEQUEL TO 'DON JUAN'

The Fairbridge Collection of the South African Library, Cape Town, contains two bound volumes of pamphlets of interest to students of Byron, the poems of George Longmore.

Longmore is not mentioned by any of the commentators on Byron, probably because most of his work was published in Cape Town and received little, if any, notice in England, but he was one of the most ardent and painstaking imitators of Byron in the generation after Byron's death and his *Don Juan, a sequel. Cantos XIX and XX* deserves not to be entirely forgotten.¹

The poem was published anonymously,² but the Preface was signed G.L. and the authorship was recognized by Longmore's contemporaries.

In the Preface Longmore states that he has attempted the sequel because of the charm of Byron's poetry for him and his perception that *Don Juan* has gradually crept into the good graces of those 'who would not formerly look on its title-page', and then explains why the sequel begins at Canto XIX when Byron's poem ends with Canto XVI:

To elucidate this point, the reader should be acquainted, that the 17th and 18th Cantos were written, but were lost in transmission to a London Bookseller, and no copy of the manuscript kept....

The connecting links comprised in these two Cantos, (between his Lordship's Story, and the subject commenced upon in the 19th Canto) were, the nightly frolic of the fair Duchess, who was personifying the Black Friar, which was carried to its *dénouement*, it being hunted to her 'that walls had eyes, as well as ears', causing rather a hasty departure from Norman Abbey, which concluded the 17th Canto, and in the 18th, an attempt to carry out Byron's plot, as expressed in the 100th stanza of his 14th Canto, where he says,

But great things spring from little:—Would you think,
That in our youth, as dangerous a passion
As e'er brought man and woman to the brink
Of ruin, rose from such a slight occasion,
As few would ever dream, could form the link
Of such a sentimental situation?
You'll never guess,—I bet you millions, millions—
It all sprung from a harmless game at billiards.

This *harmless* game, happening between Juan and Aurora Raby, arouses the Lady Adeline's jealousy, and leads to a moonlight adventure between the latter and our hero, near to the mysterious Abbey window,—the superstition attached to which, is so beautifully described.

¹ Longmore entered the Royal Staff Corps in 1808 and fought in the Peninsular War. Thereafter he was stationed in Canada and later acted as Surveyor-General in Mauritius. In 1834 he sold out of the army and came to the Cape as one of the special magistrates under the Slave Emancipation Act. Subsequently he was appointed first Resident Magistrate of Wynberg and colonial Aide-de-Camp to the Governor. At the first meeting of the Cape House of Assembly in 1854, he was appointed Sergeant-at-Arms and Librarian. He died in 1867. I am indebted to Mr Ralph Kilpin, Clerk Assistant in the Union House of Assembly, for the foregoing information.

² *Don Juan, a sequel, Cantos XIX and XX*. Cape Town: Printed and published for the author, by W. L. Sammons, 1850.

Where in the noontide of the moon, and when
 The wind is wing'd from one point of the heaven,
 There moans a strange unearthly sound which then
 Is musical,—a dying accent driven
 Through the huge arch, which soars and sinks again,
 Some deem it but the distant echo given
 Back to the night-wind by the waterfall,
 And harmoniz'd by the old choral wall. [Co. XIII, 63.]

This strange sound is heard, and being said to forebode misfortune to the house of Amundeville, creates such alarm in Adeline, as to cause a hasty retreat, and being seen, leads to circumstances which the reader will find, form the subject of the 19th Canto.

The Preface closes with a modest acknowledgement of Byron's superiority to Longmore. 'But', he writes, 'I am content, in kneeling down to touch the hem of his garment and in associating my feelings, with one who,

Heap'd Pelion on Ossa, and whose powers
 Making all other mortal hope seem vain,
 Rose, as some mighty Alp in grandeur towers
 Above its pigmy brethren of the plain.'

An *Apotheosis to Lord Byron* follows which, in some stanzas at least, would seem perhaps more applicable to Shelley:

Far, far above the level of each mind,
 All common custom seem'd to jar thy soul,
 Which sigh'd to have the pinions of the wind
 And flee beyond the sphere of earth's controul,
 A thrilling sensitiveness, undefin'd,—
 An apprehension, seeking for the goal,—
 A brilliant meteor,—an aerial strain,
 Radiant, and ravishing,—then lost again.

In Canto XIX Adeline's rendezvous with Juan seems to have been seen by Miss O'Tabby, who informs Aurora Raby. At dinner Juan receives a message from Petersburg sealed with the Imperial crest, and Adeline faints and retires to her room. The letter was from Catherine, Empress of Russia, informing Juan of her anger at his continued stay at the Abbey and commanding him to proceed to Paris on a mission for her. Whilst Juan is deciding what to do, Aurora Raby walks into his chamber in her sleep and rests on his bed. Juan decides to obey the Empress's commands, to keep in her good graces and to free himself from an awkward situation. Early in the morning Adeline hears the sound of carriage wheels, visits Juan's room to find if he has gone, and discovers Aurora there. They are seen leaving Juan's room, to the great scandal of the other inmates of the Abbey.

Only after three weeks does Adeline receive a letter from Juan, informing her that his doctors have advised him to go to Italy for his health's sake and thanking her and her husband for their kindness to him. He makes no protestations of love.

Canto xx opens with Juan in Paris on the eve of the Revolution, and most of the early part of the Canto is taken up with Longmore's moralizings on the state of affairs in France. Only at stanza LXVI Juan meets a maid of honour at the court, Melanie Sonbise. They walk in the gardens at Trianon, Juan gives her a rose which pricks her finger, she faints, he attends her and they fall in love. But without pursuing Juan's adventures further, Longmore ends the poem abruptly with a brief reference to the coming changes which the Revolution will bring about.

A severe but not wholly unfair criticism of the two cantos and of some of Longmore's other work was published in a broadsheet ascribed to E. B. Watermeyer¹ under the pseudonym 'Byronulus Redivivulus'.

'Tis something in the dearth of fame,
 Amid this dull and boorish race,
 To sing of vice in style so tame,
 So guiltless of poetic grace,
 That Morpheus o'er the soul must creep,
 And heavy eye-lids sink in sleep!—
 Don Juan's stanza mine I made,
 With double rhymes and verse so quaint,—
 Don Juan's morals I pourtrayed
 Befitting gentleman nor saint;—
 'Tis Byron's Juan every bit,—
 Excepting only—Byron's wit!
 * * * * *
 Was Byron feeble towards the close?—
 The Sequel's duller still—God knows.

Much of Longmore's other work is influenced by Byron. In Canada he had written *The Charivari*² in the manner of *Beppo*, a poem based on the charivari custom introduced into Canada from France. The most striking feature of *The War of the Isles*,³ in which Longmore gives his reminiscences of the Peninsular War, is the number of *verbatim* borrowings from *Childe Harold*.⁴ His *Florio*,

¹ Egdius Benedictus Watermeyer (1824–67), b Cape Town. Studied law in England, and was called to the Bar (Inner Temple). Admitted as advocate in the Cape, 1847. M.L.A. for Worcester, C.P., 1854–5, in the first Cape Parliament. Later raised to the Bench.

² *The charivari or Canadian poetics. a tale, after the manner of Beppo*. Montreal. printed for the publisher, 1824.

³ *The war of the isles*, a poem, in ten cantos: with notes. By G. Longmore, Esq. Captain in the Royal Staff Corps. London: Printed for T. Cadell, Strand; and W. Blackwood. Edinburgh. By W. T. Moncrieff, 104 Drury-lane, 1826.

⁴ Cp.

Longmore
 And then, and there i, 31
 Sophist—or saint iv, 1
 brook brawl'd iv, 21
 banded nations viii, 21; ix, 16
 Ancient of days viii, 24
 hopes of many nations ix, 18
 unreturning brave ix, 20
 And there was hurrying ix, 23
 Itaha, oh, Itaha x, 32

Byron

Ah! then and there iii, 24
 saint, sage, or sophist ii, 6
 brawling brook iv, 33
 iii, 18
 ii, 2
 hope of many nations iv, 168
 iii, 27
 Ah! then and there was hurrying iii, 24
 iv, 42

Euphrosyne and *Byzantium*¹ seem to have been inspired by Byron's oriental poems.

Byron, however, was not Longmore's only source of inspiration. His own disgust with the times probably urged him to write *The Spirit of the Age*,² and three poems on missionary themes³ were suggested to him after hearing a lecture in Cape Town in 1838 or 1839 by John Williams, one of the most famous missionaries to the South Sea Islands.

E. R. SEARY.

GRAHAMSTOWN, SOUTH AFRICA.

WERE WALTHER AND WOLFRAM ONCE AT THE SAME COURT?

Parz. 294, 21 frou minne, hie seht ir zuo:
ich wæn manz iu ze laster tuo:
wan ein gebur spræche san,
mime herrn si diz getan.
er klagt ouch, mohter sprechen.
frou minne, lat sich rechen
den werden Waleise:
wan hez in iwer vreise
unt iwer strenghe unsuezer last,
ich wæn sich werte dirre gast.

A reasonable interpretation of this passage was given as long ago as 1882 by W. Wilmanns,⁴ and in the light of his arguments it can be translated as follows: 'Frou Minne, look after your interests here. If I am not mistaken it is to *your* prejudice that this is being done: for (in a like case) a peasant would cry out immediately "Be this done as to my lord!" Parzival would protest, too, if he were able to speak. Madam, let the doughty Welshman retaliate. For if your "danger" and your harsh severity did not prevent him, I think this stranger could safely be entrusted with his own self-defence.'⁵ The line *mime herrn si diz getan* is held to be a reference to Walther, 40, 26 *frowe Minne, daz si iu getan*. It then follows, if in a like case a peasant would cry out 'Be this done as to my lord!' and if by contrast Parzival could nevertheless be entrusted with his own self-defence, that Wolfram is having a sly dig at Walther.

¹ *Euphrosyné, a Turkish tale; Florio, or the muse and the maid; with other poems*. By George Longmore. Cape Town. Published by A. S. Robertson, 1851. *Byzantium*: a poem, in two cantos. [Cape Town] A. S. Robertson, 1855.

² *The spirit of the age*. A satire. Published for the author. Albion Press, Cape Town, 1837.

³ *The missionary*. A poem. Parts I and II. Cape Town. Published for the author, at the Gleaner Press, 1839. *Guy Alric and other poems*. Cape Town: Published for the author, by A. S. Robertson, 24 Heerengracht, 1844. *The pilgrims of faith*, in three cantos: with minor poems. By George Longmore. Published by A. S. Robertson, Adderley-street, Cape Town, 1860.

⁴ *Das Leben und Dichten Walthers von der Vogelweide*, p. 453.

⁵ In this rendering all other considerations have been sacrificed to the sense, which contains a legal argument from German *Waffenrecht*.

This interpretation would agree with Wolfram's known views on Minnesang as expressed in *Parzival*, 115, 5ff. In 1900 K. Burdach expressed his full acceptance of Wilmanns' views.¹ The present writer has nothing to object beyond the slight 'illogicality' of *er klagt ouch* (it is irony), but this is not an insurmountable difficulty, since Wolfram goes on to define the form which Parzival's protest would take. the active protest of arms, not the refuge in *Waffenrecht* which lay open to the peasant, the merchant or the Jew.

Neither Wilmanns nor Burdach pushed this argument to its logical conclusion.² If it was Wolfram's intention to poke fun at a sentiment from low life in *Walther*, 40, 26 and hint that by contrast Parzival would have defended himself like a knight (294, 30), then we are told between the lines that Walther himself was or had lately been at court. for in a contrast *dirre gast* logically implies *jener gast*. The full thought would then be: 'For this stranger, Parzival, hege man as he is to Frou Minne, would defend himself instead of seeking the protection meted out to inferiors (by *Waffenrecht*), unlike the other stranger, Walther, who is (or lately was) with us here at court.'

If these arguments are accepted, Walther must have been at the same court as Wolfram during the latter's publication of *Parzival*, Book VI. When and where that was is for others to decide. But the quotation of Walther's line *quoten tac, bæse unde quot* (297, 25) only eighty-five lines later in the same book, with the ambiguous tense of the preceding line *des muoz her Walther singen* and the direct address of Hermann von Thüringen (297, 16ff.), would suggest they were together at the Landgrave's court. At the very least Wolfram, for one reason or another, has Walther von der Vogelweide well in mind.

A. T. HATTO.

LONDON.

AN UNPUBLISHED POEM BY PHILIP VON ZESSEN

In 1650 Zesen wrote the following in the album of Christoph Arnold of Nürnberg:

Zez!

Sechs-stufige Reimbaude.

Tugend hat leider! alzuviel neider, aber indessen
werd' ich sie dennoch allezeit lieben, nimmer vergessen.

¹ *Walther von der Vogelweide*, I, 15f.

² As far as M. Marti's 1927 edition of Bartsch's *Parzival* is concerned, Wilmanns and Burdach wrote in vain, for she retains her predecessor's nonsensical reading.

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | Wilst-du die Rosen unter den Dornen follig ab-brechen, must-du nicht achten, oder betrachten, daß sie dich stechen. |
| Wahl-spruch. | Mit diesen wenigen Zeilen hat sich der beliebten gunst- |
| Last Haget Lust | gewogenheit und gutem andenken des Herrn Besitzers |
| <i>Pax Cladem Sequitur.</i> | dieses wohlwollender manung anbefehlen wollen und sollen |

Filip von Zesen

Im Ertzschrein der Amstelinnen
den 14. Haum. 1650.

Christoph Arnold,¹ son of the theologian Caspar Arnold (1599–1666). was born at Hersbruck, near Nürnberg, in 1627. He studied in Altdorf and travelled in Holland, Germany and England, his principal journeys falling between 1649 and 1651. He seems to have sought in particular the acquaintance of philologists, though names of men well known in other fields are to be found in his album. Most of the entries, such as those of Georg Philipp Harsdörffer (50r), Nicolaus Heinsius (78r), John Selden (105r), Jeremy Collier (42r) and John Milton (85v), contain only the usual fulsome compliments in Latin. Milton's entry is written by another hand, though it bears the poet's signature, for at that time (November 1651) he was beginning to lose his sight. Three entries stand out from the others. They are written in Old Teutonic languages. Abraham Whelock, Cambridge University Librarian (87r), and Junius (103r) each supply a quotation from the Anglo-Saxon Homilies in the original, and an Icelandic Þorkill Arngrímsson ('Thorchillus Arngrimi', 111r) wrote two Icelandic gnomes, one in runes. This shows an interest in Germanistics which is surely connected with Arnold's later book *Von den alten deutschen Götzen*. After his return from his journeys Arnold became Dean of the Marienkirche and Professor at the Auditorium Aegidianum at Nürnberg, in which city he died on 30 June 1685.

The poem by Zesen is not to be found in any of the poet's published works in the British Museum or in the libraries of Basel. It shows the true flowing line and languorous harmony characteristic of Zesen. The spelling differs somewhat from his normal practice.

The anagram or sign above the poem has been transliterated *Zez!* It is difficult to decipher, and strongly resembles the monograms of German student *Verbindungen*.

LEONARD FORSTER.

CAMBRIDGE.

¹ For Christoph Arnold see Jocher's *Gelehrtenlexicon*, vol. i, and the *Fortsetzung*, vol. i. Also G. Waterhouse, *Literary Relations between England and Germany in the Seventeenth Century*, Cambridge, 1914.

REVIEWS

Essays and Addresses. By OLIVER ELTON. London. Edward Arnold. 1939. 275 pp. 7s. 6d.

Professor Elton's latest 'sheaf' contains eleven essays. three on English poets (the British Academy Lecture of 1936 on *Style in Shakespeare*, the Nottingham Byron Lecture for 1924 on *The Present Value of Byron*, and the Presidential Address to the English Association delivered in 1922 on *Robert Bridges and 'The Testament of Beauty'*); four on Slavonic literature, which has recently engaged so much of his attention (one apiece on Pushkin and Chekhov and two on Karel Capek), two, 'of a more abstract kind', dealing with *Reason and Enthusiasm in the Eighteenth Century*, and with *The Nature of Literary Criticism*, and owing, we are told, 'much to the old, the never quite forgotten, discipline of "Greats"'; and finally a couple of 'brief notices in *pian memoriam*' of George Saintsbury and James Fitzmaurice-Kelly. It is an attractive and varied table of contents, and I can assure readers of this *Review* who have still zest, 'in time of the breaking of nations', for the ripe fruits of learning and wisdom that the feast more than fulfils the promise of the menu. And leaning to us, as it were, across the comely well-lit table, is the courtly host himself, who embodies the best qualities of English scholarship, its selflessness, its discipline, its urbane humanity, and its penetrating power. He is the Dean of our Faculty in Britain, and at this moment (July 1940) in the history of the island race, it is difficult to imagine a more perfect representative of the values it is called upon to defend.

Of the individual articles it is impossible to say much in a review; the more so that the reviewer finds himself, as Professor Elton does in reading Chekhov, 'dipping all the time in a lucky bag in which almost everything is a prize'. Pushkin was one of the peaks of European letters inaccessible to Englishmen until Professor Elton and Professor Hewitt began translating him for us; here is the authoritative introduction to him. Chekhov has been long translated, and much has been written upon him in this country; but no one, I think, before Professor Elton has so well brought out the 'gentle tint of mockery' that colours the sentiment which is Chekhov's 'deep musical theme'. That appreciations on Byron and Bridges should follow one another is a measure of the critic's catholicity; for what two poets could be more dissimilar in style and spirit? That both criticisms should be eminently *just* is a proof of what I have called his humanity and penetrating power. And speaking of justice, one rejoices to find the idyll of Juan and Haidee hailed as Byron's masterpiece 'in point of clean plastic beauty and harmonious execution'; and to read this on the *Testament of Beauty*:

Bridges is far from any sort of cheap or eye-shutting optimism. There is plenty of vehement satire, and much scornful reprobation of the ill things that hinder the progress of the soul. The passages on Sappho, and on the professors of Hedonism, will come to mind. Bridges, perhaps, is at his raciest and fiercest when he turns aside to denounce every sort of communism, socialism, and 'equalitarian' theory. He does not argue; he was not, I think, a man to argue with. But whatever their relevance, we owe some of the most splendid things in his poem to this opinion or prejudice.

How fresh, too, and up-to-date, and yet classically sane, is the essay on *The Nature of Literary Criticism*! And though the commentaries upon Shakespeare run now into ranges of mountains (mostly, alas, moraines of rubbish), where else are we to find a track, well and truly laid, to the all-important subject of the dramatist's style except in the volume before us?

J. DOVER WILSON.

EDINBURGH.

Two Lives of St Cuthbert. By BERTRAM COLGRAVE. Cambridge: University Press. 1940. xiv+375 pp. 21s.

The two lives of St Cuthbert contained in this delightful book are no new discovery, since the Anonymous Life has been printed thrice and the longer life by Bede no less than ten times. But the texts have never been given the scholarly treatment they deserve, and seeing that in this country they are most accessible in Giles' *Bedae Opera* (1843), those who are familiar with the texts produced by that prolific, precipitate and negligent editor, will give a warm welcome to this fine piece of work. Full justice has been done to the text of Bede, but the text of the Anonymous is less satisfactory and calls for some criticism. Mr Colgrave has based it on the oldest MS., styled O₁ (St Omer 267—late ninth century)—an honest MS., but in places badly corrupted, so badly indeed that more than once the translation cannot correspond with the text. It is quite clear that the Anonymous author was an educated man with a real sense of style, and it is a poor compliment to him to print obvious corruptions in the text without a word of explanation. Take (e.g.) a passage at the end of II, 3 (p. 82): *narrans. .quod spiritalibus oculis latitantem eum et probantem, sicut uiderat Petrus Ananniam et Saphram spiritum sanctum temptantem, mirabiliter defamauit.* It is almost certain that the original ran *uiderat sicut Petrus* (a correction found in a later MS.). The sense then will be: 'telling them that Cuthbert had seen him with his spiritual eyes lying hid and testing him, just as Peter saw Ananias and Sapphira tempting the Holy Spirit, he spread abroad the story to a wonderful extent' (*defamauit* = *diffamauit*, a common error, which may well have been in the original). *Defamauit* is ignored in the translation, unless it is translated 'detected', which it cannot mean. A similar problem occurs in II, 8 (p. 92) where the editor has translated *sciebat homini Dei spectandam esse or sciebat quod h.D. spectanda erat*; whereas the text runs *sciens homini Dei expectanda erat*. A note is clearly desirable in cases such as this. So too notes are required on *nodibus* for *nodis* (p. 66), *estualia* for *estualia* (p. 70), *panne linea* for *panno lineo* (p. 70), *odoribus*, in the sense of 'breath' (? 'fragrant breath') (p. 80), *fantas* for *fantasias*, *fantasia* for *fantastica* and *fallatos* for *falsos* (p. 88). It may be remarked that the editor does at times abandon O₁; e.g. p. 94 where *abscedens* is given in the text for *adcedes*, whereas the note (p. 324) seems to assume that the latter is in the text. The Apparatus Criticus is full and helpful, but might well have been compressed, since it contains too many readings (e.g. familiar varieties of spelling) which are of no significance for the establishment, history or interpretation of the text. These are however but minor

blemishes in a really good book. The translation is charming and, as a rule, close and accurate, though it may be doubted whether 'sacred' is an adequate translation of *delicatae* (p. 60), while 'tricks' is not strong enough for *scurrilitatem* ('buffoonery') or 'dwelling' for *tugurunculi* ('little hovel'). The notes are learned, helpful and preeminently readable, while the Introduction is full of information and lucidly expressed, and Mr Colgrave is to be congratulated on the diligence with which he has hunted out MSS. and the care with which he has collated them. As for the two Lives, they are both singularly attractive. The *Anonymous Life*, written by a monk of Lindisfarne (699-705) not more than eight years after Cuthbert's death, has a charm of its own, which tends at times to be lost in the expanded form which Bede gave it some 16 years later, despite its grace and its superior Latinity, though the additions made by Bede are in some cases of real value and interest. There is a good index and the publishers have produced a book which is a pleasure to the eye.

H. E. BUTLER.

LONDON.

The Text of the Canterbury Tales: Studied on the Basis of All Known Manuscripts. By JOHN M. MANLY and EDITH RICKERT with the aid of MABEL DEAN, HELEN MCINTOSH, and others. With a chapter on Illuminations by MARGARET RICKERT. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1940. Eight volumes. £12 the set.

This is indeed a monumental work, even in the stricter sense, owing to the deeply regretted deaths of Miss Rickert shortly before and of Professor Manly shortly after its publication. It is the result of labours extending over fifteen years and involving many assistants. The general plan of the volumes is as follows: I, Descriptions of the Manuscripts; II, Classification of the Manuscripts; III-IV, Text and Critical Notes; V-VIII, Corpus of Variants.

The descriptions in the first volume of the 83 CT MSS. or parts of MSS. take account of contents, form, watermarks, collation, date, writing, ink, supervision and correction, illumination, binding, present condition, order of tales, affiliations and textual character, dialect and spelling, special features, and provenance. The notes on provenance (duly indexed) are a mine of information concerning Chaucer's associates and other owners, early and late, of MS. copies of the poem. The remaining items in volume I are a list of CT MSS. recorded in sale catalogues, letters, etc., a list of the reference books used, and chapters on illuminations, and on spelling and dialect. The second volume contains chapters on the order of the tales, on early and revised versions, and on methods of collation. This last has already been hailed by competent judges as an epoch-making contribution in its own field. It is not, however, for editors only. Among other matters of general interest it points out that the current theories of Chaucer's versification are based on an artificial text. The third volume has chapters on glosses, headings and endings, and divisions within the

tales. The text printed in this and the succeeding volume is the text as established by the processes of recension. It follows the order of the Ellesmere MS., and bases its spelling on Ellesmere and Hengwrt. Footnotes cite Skeat, the Globe editors, Koch, and Robinson wherever any difference of reading occurs. The critical notes at the end discuss proposed emendations ancient and modern. The last four volumes record all the variants in the MSS. except those in spelling and in the rubrics at the beginnings and endings of tales and links. The reason for the omission of these rubric variants is that they are given in detail in *The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* (1933) by the late Sir William McCormick with the assistance of Janet E. Heseltine.

The eight volumes together amount to some 4750 pages, and these are packed with facts of a kind which are exceedingly difficult both to extract and to present. One detail may help to focus the impressiveness of the achievement. The volumes are printed from reduced photographic plates of typewritten pages. Had ordinary book type been used, says Professor Manly, the necessary proof reading 'would have required two or three years more'. The lithography has no obvious disadvantages and has probably increased the degree of accuracy. This seems exceptionally high throughout. A total of about 110 errata are listed on the last pages of the volumes devoted to variants. Others doubtless exist, as the editors realized, but so far I have noted only such trifling slips as Fastoff for Fastolf (I, 669) and FKT for FkT (III, 531).

This definitive edition of the text of the *Canterbury Tales* provides all the means the MSS. afford for discovering Chaucer's intentions for the poem, including the important matter of the successive phases in his ordering of the tales. It is not surprising that the editors offer no solution to this highly complex problem, but it is disappointing to find them apparently implying that no solution is possible. 'Inasmuch', they say, 'as the evidence of the MSS. seems to show clearly that Chaucer was not responsible for any of the extant arrangements, there is no reason to discuss the arguments of previous scholars as to his reasons for changes.' Yet several of the 'arguments' thus passed over have unquestionably shed light on the subject, and, in so doing, suggest that it is perhaps too soon to admit defeat. For instance, Professor Carleton Brown has recently shown (*PMLA*, Dec., 1933) that MS. evidence combined with internal evidence reveals much about the various steps in the evolution of the 'Marriage Group' of tales. On the same kind of evidence the same scholar has also shown convincing reasons (*SP*, Jan., 1937) for concluding that at an early stage in the history of the poem the first individual prologue was the Man of Law's and his tale the *Tale of Melibeus*. As a result of disregarding these and other valuable contributions, the chapter in the new edition on 'The Order of the Tales' may strike some Chaucerians as behind rather than ahead of the study of its subject.

Another of the editors' suggestions, if true, would necessitate a fresh start in our attempts to understand Chaucer's purpose for the *Canterbury Tales*. According to an apparently justifiable reading of the evidence, his decision to use as the last of the narratives the *Parson's Tale*, a manual

of Christian practice for the individual, was made early and steadily maintained. And we have just seen that at one time he evidently decided to use as the first of the narratives the *Tale of Melibeus*, a manual of Christian practice for society. On these and other grounds it has seemed fairly safe to infer that he meant his pilgrimage poem to have some religious significance. Professors Manly and Ruckert, however, hold views of a different bearing. They remark 'that we lack any account of the jolly supper promised in the Prologue as the conclusion of the Pilgrimage, and that the CT as we have it ends on a very different note'. They believe Chaucer translated the two component parts of the *Parson's Tale* but doubt whether he either chose or combined them. It seems, they think, 'possible that the person—probably a priest—who composed the Retraction found the two prose treatises among Chaucer's papers and consolidated them for the purpose of supplying the missing prose tale promised by the Parson' (iv, 527). But perhaps these speculations do not seriously challenge the earlier view. For one thing, the lack of any account of the jolly supper at the end is sufficiently explained by the unfinished state of the poem, and there is no ground for supposing that Chaucer had planned to precede it by a jolly tale. For another thing, the genuine *Parson's Prologue* not only promises just such a contribution as the Parson makes but, as the editors omit to mention, refers at line 51 to the passage in the *Book of Revelation* on 'Jerusalem celestial' which is referred to in the opening paragraph of the *Parson's Tale*. This echo gives some positive evidence for thinking that when Chaucer wrote the *Parson's Prologue* he had in mind the *Parson's Tale* in its present form. The only basis for the contrary contention seems to be disapproval of the way in which the two parts are put together. Yet we cannot be certain that they were not already combined in Chaucer's source.

The volume to which many scholars will turn most eagerly is that which attempts to determine the relationships and relative authority of the CT MSS. Here the editors had to deal with a chaos which is perhaps the worst of its kind in existence. They reduce the number of MSS. whose behaviour needs to be considered in establishing the text to twenty-nine. These comprise four genetic groups, designated *a*, *b*, *c*, and *d*, the single MSS. El, Gg, and Hg, and in connexion with them Ha⁴, Ad³, and Ha⁵. The members of Group *a* have essentially the same arrangement as El but are not derived from the same immediate ancestor. El was made by the scribe of Hg about a decade later with fuller materials. 'According to palaeographical and other evidence Hg [1400-10] represents the earliest attempt after Chaucer's death to arrange in a single MS. the tales and links left unarranged by him'. Groups *c* and *d* have a common ancestor. Group *b* has hitherto been unanimously assigned to the same tradition, but Professor Manly now considers it possibly independent. Of these three groups, *c* is apparently the earliest and Cp (1410-20) is its best representative. Those are the outstanding conclusions of the volume on classification. Whether they are wholly reliable can be tested only by intensive use. From a cursory examination it does not appear that *c* is earlier than *d* or that *b* is independent of *d* and *c*. But even if justified

disagreement should arise it will not alter this fact: that exactly where the jungle of Chaucerian problems was densest Professors Manly and Rickert have built a highroad for advance.

MARGARET GALWAY.

LONDON.

Das Bild Sir Philip Sidneys in der englischen Renaissance. By BERTA SIEBECK. (*Schriften der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft.* Neue Folge, Bd. 3.) Weimar: Hermann Böhlau. 1939. xvi+198 pp. M. 7.05.

Dr Siebeck's purpose is to investigate Sidney's contemporary reputation as revealed in dedications, correspondence, epitaphs, elegies, the work of the Countess of Pembroke's circle and early seventeenth-century 'lives'. The work thus fills a gap between biographical research on the one hand and literary research on the other, and its four chronological lists of dedications, epitaphs, elegies and early references to Sidney between his death and c. 1630 have assembled much information that needed collecting as a preliminary to a more definitive study of Sidney's life and works than has yet appeared. The book also contains a useful critical appendix (pp. 141-81) on portraits of Sidney, their authenticity, present whereabouts, former history and so on.

It is in the collecting of information of this kind that the book's usefulness lies, though it makes no claim to be exhaustive and surprises, in fact, by some amazing omissions (e.g. the references to Sidney in Webbe and Puttenham), but the subject hardly repays treatment at this length. The investigation does little more than corroborate what the hitherto partial knowledge of the facts made sufficiently clear, namely, that in his lifetime Sidney made a profounder impression on continental scholars with whom he came in contact than on his countrymen and that it was not until after his death that these acclaimed him as the age's ideal. The material, however, lacks variety and so does its treatment. In this last respect there is much that will weary and much that will annoy, especially the unnecessary introduction of well-known literary and biographical facts. A more generous assumption of a basic knowledge of the period on the part of the reader and a more subtle analysis of the significance of the material collected would have been more stimulating than the present mechanical handling.

ALICE WALKER.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN.

England's Musical Poet: Thomas Campion. By MILES MERWIN KASTEN-DIECK. New York: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1939. 203 pp. 14s.

Most students of the Renaissance will now admit that the lyric of the period cannot be properly understood without some knowledge of the music intended to accompany it. The relations between music and poetry were then peculiarly intimate, and the structure and content of the lyric

were determined as much by the musical resources of the time as by purely literary influences. To those who realize this Campion must always appear a very central figure in the history of poetry, for he set his own verses to music and was thus able to achieve remarkable success in wedding the two arts, a kind of success that his contemporaries recognized as desirable in all lyric poetry. It is strange, therefore, that this book by Mr Kastendieck is the first attempt to study Campion as both poet and composer and to find out how he managed to couple words and notes so lovingly together. A. H. Bullen restored Campion to anthologies and histories of literature as long ago as 1887, and Vivian published the definitive edition of his works in 1909. Since then Campion has received much admiration but not much critical attention, and nobody has felt qualified to judge him as he himself would have wished. Mr Kastendieck's book is to be welcomed because it does regard him as more than a good poet. It shows how the verse is disposed in a way that will make a musical setting effective, and how the music often heightens the appeal of lines and phrases, by repetition, for instance. Campion's care in setting the accents and quantities of his words is illustrated, and the way the rise and fall of his melodies suits both the declamation of the words and the general moods of the poems. An interesting chapter on the *Observations in the Art of English Poesy* argues that Campion's quantitative experiments came from his practice in setting verse to music. Perhaps more than justice is done here to a treatise that has been often too summarily dismissed. It can scarcely be denied that Campion shares much of his contemporaries' confusion between accent and quantity: he calls the first syllables of 'spirit' and 'rigour' long, whereas they are obviously short stressed syllables (p. 98). A few slips like this, however, do not invalidate Mr Kastendieck's contention that Campion had a remarkably keen ear for quantity and made many observations still of great value to practical poets.

By his detailed examination of Campion's efforts to reconcile the claims of music and poetry, Mr Kastendieck has added to our appreciation of the poet-composer's art. At times he is rather too impressed by Campion's achievement. He praises the tune of 'I care not for those ladies' because it faithfully reproduces the natural rise and fall of the speaking voice (p. 134): actually Campion may not have composed the tune; a version of it is found in Praetorius (from whom it is reproduced in the English Hymnal, no. 179). 'Follow thy fair sun' is cited as an instance of Campion's correct handling of quantity; but in the last line three minims are given to the second syllable of 'unhappy', a short syllable though stressed (p. 131). Campion rightly wished to bring this syllable into prominence, and the vowel happens to be very suitable for a held note, but his quantity is incorrect. Mr Kastendieck, in fact, rather tends to over-emphasize the need for identity of pattern in poem and tune. Each has a life of its own; and a successful song is not made by confining the music to a slavish reproduction of the poetic rhythm, but by seeing that there is no conflict between the two patterns and that neither unduly limits the scope of the other.

The least satisfactory feature of the book is its treatment of the background against which Campion is viewed. His importance is chiefly as representative of the preoccupations of poets and composers in his age. His theories about the ayre would be clarified and made more significant by being placed in their context. Mr Kastendieck often gives wrong impressions about the background, or at any rate is not careful enough to guard against misunderstandings among those who do not know the period well. He does not make it clear that some of Campion's devices were merely conventional—his repetition of musical phrases, for instance (p. 172), and his use of chromaticism (p. 158), which was well established in the madrigal by his time. Campion's disdain of 'childish observing of words' (p. 164) did not imply a refusal to indulge in 'decorative or flowery writing' such as the 'fa la' refrains in ballets. Like the Italian declamatory school, he believed that the hearer would be moved more by adherence to the natural inflections of impassioned speech than by the elaborate 'word-painting' technique of the madrigal, in which every striking word was illustrated by melodic, contrapuntal and harmonic conventions. Campion's views belong to the movement of thought that produced the monodic style of the seventeenth century. But it is wrong to overemphasize Campion's importance in the history of harmony. His treatise on counterpoint is a clear and useful text-book, but it only formulates rules that all musicians knew very well in practice. He himself was little more than a creator of charming tunes, and he had just sufficient art to support them with adequate chords. Nor did the greater movement of thought in which he played a part, and to which the Florentine Camarata belongs, do much more than restrict the resources of the time to a rather precious notion of what Greek practice had been. It is hardly correct to say that in the sixteenth century 'harmony existed only by accident or courtesy' (p. 118). The later madrigal composers were very daring and original in their use of harmony, and to them it was not merely ancillary to counterpoint.

The result of these few careless asides is to obscure the real importance of the ayre in musical history, and especially the importance of Campion's theories about the ayre. It is suggested that the lutenist ayres were the first real accompanied solo songs; that stage requirements tended to favour monodic rather than polyphonic style, but that the early stage songs were performed by soloists who played an instrument in unison with the voice part (p. 60). Actually the early court plays often contained solos elaborately accompanied by strings, and the texture of these settings was polyphonic. Nor can it be claimed that the lutenist school superseded the contrapuntal school of the madrigal composers (p. 54). England was considerably behind Italy in her cultivation of the madrigal, and both ayre and madrigal flourished together during the first two decades of the seventeenth century. Both are expressions of that aspect of the Renaissance mind which caused the domination of literary ideas in all musical composition.

Though the scope of Mr Kastendieck's book is a little too narrow and the writing often not precise enough, the detailed examination it provides

of Campion's methods and the secrets of his success are a definite contribution to scholarship, and the book can be recommended to readers who know the period well enough to fit the author's analysis into its proper context.

BRUCE PATTISON.

LONDON.

Defoe's Review. Reproduced from the Original Editions, with an Introduction and Bibliographical Notes by A. W. SECORD. New York: Columbia University Press for the Facsimile Text Society. 1938. 22 vols. \$88.

Defoe in the Pillory and Other Studies. By JOHN ROBERT MOORE. *Indiana University Publications: Humanities Series*, No. 1. Bloomington, Indiana. 1939. xii + 249 pp. \$2.

Most of the valuable work on Defoe during the last thirty years has come from outside his native country. German and Dutch scholars have always shown a keen interest in him, and in France Professor Dottin has added greatly to our knowledge of his life and to our understanding of his character. It is to America, however, and more especially to the late W. P. Trent, that the modern study of Defoe is most indebted; and it is clear that he has left behind him men who are well fitted to carry on his work. The appearance, after considerable delay, of a facsimile edition of the whole of his famous (but now exceedingly scarce) *Review* is itself an indication of American interest in Defoe. The work was planned some ten years ago, and one is tempted to suggest that only in a country accustomed to vast public works would such an undertaking—a kind of academic irrigation scheme—have been carried out successfully, or even contemplated. The burden of the work has fallen on the capable shoulders of Professor Secord, but he gladly acknowledges the assistance from scholars working in the same field as himself. He has carried out a detailed and arduous task with judgement, patience, and accuracy.

There was an excellent case for reproducing the *Review* in facsimile. Its importance to the historian and to the student of literature was not in doubt; but no complete set of it exists in any public or private library, and only three sets are even approximately complete—the Crossley, in the British Museum, the Trent, in Boston Public Library, and the Huth, now in the hands of a private collector in Illinois. (Since the appearance of the facsimile edition, the Bodleian has greatly strengthened its file of the *Review* by the purchase of several volumes which turned up unexpectedly in Scotland, and which were unknown to Professor Secord and his collaborators.) For English scholars there has been no complete run of the rare volume IX available; the British Museum volume lacks eighteen numbers. All but one of those have now been supplied in the facsimile. The number still missing—the *Review* of 9 April 1713—is the only one in the entire run of Defoe's periodical from 1704 to 1714 which has escaped the vigilance of Professor Secord and his assistants. Apart, however, from the fact that no set of the *Review* in any public library is

complete, it is doubtful how much longer the curators of our libraries will allow readers to shuffle their way through the already frail leaves of the original numbers. Indeed, the whole question of preserving the files of seventeenth and eighteenth century newspapers may soon become acute. They are certainly being read to-day far more frequently than in the past, and it is equally certain that they will not stand up indefinitely to even moderately careful handling. Those who have done much reading in the newspapers of the early eighteenth century will probably agree that they seem not always to have been handled with even moderate care. The reader who consults them is generally looking for some particular fact, and there are too often signs of the ardour of his pursuit.

The *Review*, at any rate, is now safe. Since reproduction has invariably been made from the best copy available, this facsimile is almost everywhere perfectly legible, though there is inevitably a certain deadness about the page. Professor Secord has supplied a valuable bibliographical commentary, behind which lies more painstaking collation than one cares to contemplate, and he has dealt authoritatively with such intricate topics as paper and printing, the Edinburgh editions, and what he calls the 'imperfects', i.e. numbers without dates and advertisements. Two unique copies of a Dublin reprint, once in Professor Trent's collection, have apparently disappeared.

Of the numerous points raised by Professor Secord in his Introduction, there is space to deal with one only. He notes that the number for 5 May 1713 (No. 91) is almost identical with that for 28 April (No. 89), and that both contain a long apology from Defoe to his judges for commenting on his own case while it was still *sub judice*. (Defoe had appeared before the Court of the Queen's Bench in April for writing three ironical pamphlets on the question of the succession.) The only known copy of No. 91 is that in the Trent collection, and it had therefore remained unknown to European students of Defoe. Professor Secord uses it, quite fairly, to question a date given in my *Defoe* (p. 198); but he does not appear to have noticed that the two numbers under discussion are not only almost identical, but that the type had apparently been left standing in the printing house for a week, and that the number for 5 May is printed from the same setting of type, with certain small but important additions to the text inserted. It looks, indeed, as if Defoe's judges (under pressure from the Earl of Oxford) were prepared to postpone his sentence, possibly *sine die*, but that they were not prepared to ignore his affront to the Court of the Queen's Bench, and that he had been ordered to make a public apology in his *Review*, where the offence had been given, and to make that apology not once, but *twice*. The fate that Defoe nearly suffered on this occasion was probably another bout of the pillory, and sentence to the pillory usually entailed not one, but two, or even three, appearances. It is plausible to suppose that the Lord Chief Justice's instructions to Defoe about printing a public apology were on an analogy with the sentence he would no doubt have preferred to pass upon him, and that Defoe, knowing from the start that he would have to repeat the apology, instructed his printer to leave the type standing. This,

of course, is only conjecture, but if it is well founded, it destroys any deductions that might be drawn from No. 91 as to the date of Defoe's release.

Professor Moore's interesting volume of Defoe studies, part biographical and part literary, is a sobering reminder of how much still remains to be done in illuminating the dark corners of Defoe's life and in establishing the canon of his works. Like other students of Defoe, Professor Moore has been puzzled by the severity of the sentence passed upon Defoe in 1703, a sentence apparently out of all proportion to the offence. In the study which gives the title to this volume, he has examined the background of the 1703 trial, and has patiently and skilfully reconstructed the situation with which Defoe was faced. One had suspected that his sentence was a cumulative one, that Defoe, in fact, was being punished for past offences; but it has been left to Professor Moore to show—and he has done it with remarkable success—just what Defoe found himself up against. Professor Moore has taken the trouble to enquire into the composition of the Court of Oyer and Terminer by which Defoe was tried on 7 July 1703, and he has found that among those who were sitting in judgment on him—or who, at any rate, were entitled so to sit—there were several whom he had previously satirized, and satirized unmercifully, in his *Reformation of Manners* and elsewhere. This investigation is indeed a pretty piece of work, and the most satisfactory chapter in the book. In other chapters Professor Moore gives his reasons for ascribing to Defoe *The Voyage of Don Manuel Gonzales* (in part), *Robert Drury's Journal*, and, most important of all, *A General History of the Pirates*, attributed on the title-page to Captain Charles Johnson. The arguments by which he supports these attributions are of various kinds, but inevitably he is driven to lean heavily upon internal evidence, and here we come upon the old problem of whether Defoe's mannerisms are sufficiently pronounced and sufficiently peculiar to make his work unmistakable. 'There is nothing more foolish', Pope believed, 'than to pretend to be sure of knowing a great writer by his style.' It should be said that Professor Moore is well aware of the dangers of relying too exclusively on stylistic evidence, and he handles his case with scholarly discretion. To be able to use such evidence at all the critic requires a comprehensive and intimate knowledge of his author's work; and behind the arguments which are here presented so clearly lie years of careful reading. The argument in favour of giving the *History of the Pirates* to Defoe is perhaps the most convincing; and if Professor Moore succeeds in obtaining the assent of scholars to this attribution he will have added an important work to the canon.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

LONDON.

The Journal of David Garrick describing his visit to France and Italy in 1763. Edited by G. W. STONE, JR. New York: The Modern Language Association of America; London: H. Milford. 1939. xv+73 pp. 7s. Garrick's *Journal* consists of a set of brief notes in which he recorded his main impressions during a journey to France and Italy. Amongst the

first things to strike Garrick in France, which he had not visited since 1751, there was the 'overcharging' of English travellers and the great alterations which had taken place in the country since his last visit. The *Comédie Française* proved rather disappointing to him. Garrick found it both dark and dirty and its acting on the whole below his expectations. From France Garrick passed into Italy. Turin met with his approval and he made note of some seventeenth-century paintings which attracted his attention over there. These included some by Guercino, Guido Reni, and Francesco Albani. Perhaps an indication of the present whereabouts of these pictures where possible might have been included in the notes. Albani's *Four Seasons*, which are particularly praised, are now in the Regia Pinacoteca of Turin.

Garrick's taste in painting must have delighted in the baroque style, for the fine Renaissance pictures of the *Ambrosiana* in Milan get no particular mention. What particularly attracted his attention in that famous library was a bilingual notice in Latin and Italian threatening excommunication against thieves and damagers of books, which he diligently transcribed. He was impressed by the vastness of Milan's *Duomo*; but on the whole he found the Lombard capital disappointing and says so. The Diary ends with Garrick's arrival at Genoa.

To these notes Mr Stone has added some lists of books which Garrick purchased in Padua with an eye to their profitable resale at some later date. They consist almost entirely of Italian works, classics and translations from Greek and Latin, printed mostly during the sixteenth century. The only book of real importance amongst them was a copy of Colonna's *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* printed by Aldus in 1499, which is erroneously listed as printed in 1467. There are also other documents referring to Garrick contained in Mr Stone's edition, including a fine letter from Munich written on 5 August 1764. The notes furnish an excellent commentary on the text, which is edited according to the strict standards of modern scholarship.

R. WEISS.

LONDON.

Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Madame du Deffand and Wiart.

Edited by W. S. LEWIS and WARREN HUNTING SMITH. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1939. 6 vols. Vol. I, lxxxviii + 407 pp. Vol. II, viii + 497 pp. Vol. III, viii + 439 pp. Vol. IV, viii + 502 pp. Vol. V, viii + 461 pp. Vol. VI, xiv + 561 pp. £12. 12s. 0d.

Letters to and from Madame du Deffand and Julie de Lespinasse. Edited by WARREN HUNTING SMITH. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1938. xxiv + 97 pp. 22s. 6d.

The Cunningham and Toynbee editions of Horace Walpole's letters omitted the letters of his correspondents, a defect which the Yale edition proposes to remedy whenever possible. The presentation of both sides of a correspondence is not, of course, a new device. It has often been adopted, and runs back almost as far as the beginnings of any attempt to gather

and print letters of outstanding interest or value. The wonder is that it should ever be neglected. The letters of that industrious antiquary, William Cole, were printed together with those of the dilettante of Strawberry Hill in the first two volumes of the Yale edition of Horace Walpole's correspondence, and with great advantage. The six volumes which now appear present letters of far greater general interest, but, unfortunately, the correspondence is almost entirely unilateral. Most of Walpole's letters are missing; and this is the more to be regretted, for the story of Madame du Deffand's friendship, it has been called 'infatuation', for Walpole is a curious chapter in his life and hers. She had never seen him, for she had long been blind before they met, and she was twenty years his senior, but from the first a powerful attraction drew her to him. During their friendship, which lasted from 1765 to 1780, the year of her death, their opportunities for meeting covered barely twelve months, divided over five visits paid by Walpole to Paris. And there remain, on an average, more than five letters written by Madame du Deffand for each month of the years in which they saw nothing of each other, letters of a pathetic devotion on her side, friendship and genuine esteem on his, mingled with a fear of being thought ridiculous.

The epistolary wealth of France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has no parallel. And among letter writers Madame du Deffand holds a place peculiarly her own. 'Her letters', it has been said, 'are incomparably superior in depth of feeling and wisdom to those of any rival of her own sex; and none of these are more pathetic and touching than the ones she addressed to Horace Walpole.' These letters well deserve the magnificent edition in which they are now presented by the joint labours of Mr Lewis and Dr Smith.

The documentary history of the correspondence is curious and involved. Madame du Deffand returned to Walpole, at his request, his side of the correspondence covering about eight years, and these were (almost certainly) destroyed by Miss Berry, Walpole's literary executrix, after she had made some use of them in her edition of Madame du Deffand's letters (1810). Nearly all the rest were destroyed by Madame du Deffand herself. All that remains of Walpole's part in this correspondence is a handful of originals, some copies, and a collection of fragments edited from quotations by Madame du Deffand, or from extracts appearing in Miss Berry's footnotes. Walpole suspected that his letters might be tampered with in the post, and a romantic find proves that his suspicion was well founded. Eleven of his letters, and parts of two, are preserved in copies now in the Archives des Affaires Étrangères in Paris. These copies were made at the post office by the French secret service.

Not less curious and romantic was the disappearance for many years, and presumed loss, of a large number of Madame du Deffand's letters. Miss Berry's edition ran to 348 letters, but only 52 of these were complete in form. Five more were added by Sainte-Aulaire in 1859. At a later date he stated that he had received the originals from Miss Berry, who assured him 'que tout le reste avait été détruit'. He had, apparently, misunderstood her; and, happily, he was mistaken in fact. After she had made

use of the Du Deffand papers Miss Berry restored them to their original cedar chest, which remained at Strawberry Hill until the sale of 1842. In 1893 the papers came into the possession of R. W. Parker-Jervis of Meaford, where they were traced by Mr Logan Pearsall Smith. and, thereafter, edited by Mrs Paget Toynbee. They are now in the Bodleian Library.

An examination of the Parker-Jervis papers shows that Miss Berry had, in her edition of Madame du Deffand's letters to Walpole, used less than a third of the material at her disposal. In 1912 appeared Mrs Paget Toynbee's not very attractive but admirably edited three volumes, *Lettres de la Marquise du Deffand à Horace Walpole*, which added nearly 500 unprinted letters in addition to printing in full 300 letters which Miss Berry had truncated. The editors of the Yale volumes unreservedly acknowledge that the 'thoroughness of Mrs Toynbee's edition has made our task much easier'.

In what characteristics, then, are the two editions differentiated, and to what extent does this new edition supersede that of Mrs Toynbee? The first and obvious difference is that of language. The Toynbee edition is wholly French, not only in text, but in introduction and commentary. The Yale volumes, as part of a complete edition of Walpole's correspondence, print the letters from the originals, but the introduction and notes are in English. It may be said, in passing, that the Toynbee introduction does still in some respect supplement that of the Yale editors who, perhaps, in one or two sections, carry compression almost too far. The account, for example, given by the Toynbee edition of earlier editions of the letters and the adventures of the originals is well set out and readily intelligible. On the other hand, the Yale tabulation of the manuscripts and printed sources is helpful, the statement of Madame du Deffand's bequest to Walpole is much more complete, the long synoptical finding list for the Toynbee and Yale editions is most useful, and there is further additional matter.

Another important difference is that the Toynbee edition is a sequence of 838 letters from Madame du Deffand to Walpole; his part, so far as it appears, is relegated to footnotes. In the Yale edition we are made aware that this is a correspondence between two people. Walpole's letters, so far as preserved in originals or copies, in fragments quoted by Miss Berry or by Madame du Deffand, are printed in the text. Furthermore, indications are given within the text of Walpole's missing letters. These headings have been gathered from lists in Walpole's *Paris Journals*, from Madame du Deffand's papers, and from allusions in her letters. Thus the text page is more complete and informative. We have the semblance of a correspondence, not merely a sequence of letters by one person opening on an unanswering void. The editors have shown admirable patience and skill in the performance of this particular part of their task.

In these volumes, further, new material has been added—a few more letters, or parts of letters, and corrections of the text. Notes written upon the originals by Walpole, or by Wiart, Madame du Deffand's secretary, are included; and, when possible, addresses and postmarks are given.

The fifth and sixth volumes contain important unpublished material, including Walpole's *Paris Journals*, a journal written by Madame du Deffand in the last year of her life, and a number of other pièces which naturally accompany the correspondence.

The text, as in the correspondence with William Cole, has been normalized. Whatever arguments may be advanced for or against this method of setting out in print letters of an earlier day, it was inevitable in these six volumes of Madame du Deffand's letters. She was blind, her handwriting bad, her spelling no better. Her amanuenses, on whom she relied for most of her correspondence, were imperfectly educated, continually confounding grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Their mistakes and their archaisms are silently corrected.

The task of annotating these letters was lightened for the editors by those who had gone before, by Walpole himself and Miss Berry, but most by Mrs Toynbee. Much also has been added. Madame du Deffand knew in person, or by repute, all the social and intellectual celebrities of France in her day. But it is allusions to people and incidents unknown to fame, obscured now by two centuries of deepening twilight, which baffle the editor and impede his progress. It is seldom, however, that the footnotes acknowledge defeat. The commentary is a model of brevity and clarity. The temptation to expansion must sometimes have been difficult to resist. Occasionally, on the other hand, there is a note to which a little more thought might have been given. In a letter of 11 September 1766 Madame du Deffand refers to 'les lettres du Docteur Swift en trois volumes'. The footnote describes this vaguely as 'A three-volume edition . . . published, London, 1766, by T. Davies (BM Cat.)', an inadequate notice of the important collection of letters, including part of the *Journal to Stella*, edited by Hawkesworth from the original manuscripts now in the British Museum (Add. MSS. 4804-6).

As this superb edition of Walpole's correspondence continues on its way admiration grows for the heroic plan upon which it has been designed, the exact editing of the text, and the unsparing labour bestowed on the commentary. An unstinted tribute of regard is due to Mr Lewis for the conception of this great project; and we have the happiness of knowing that the best of the correspondence is yet to come.

Madame du Deffand's papers, bequeathed to Walpole, included a group of letters concerning her chequered relations with Julie de Lespinasse from the beginnings to that angry quarrel which separated the two women. Miss Berry made a partial use of these letters in 1810. Dr Smith has taken the opportunity, while occupied with Madame du Deffand's letters to Walpole, to bring out a beautifully printed and attractive edition of this minor correspondence containing 31 letters. Of these, eighteen have never been published. His introduction is delightfully written; and, apart from its curious interest, this little volume is of value for the additional light it throws on the story of an oft-recounted friendship.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

ASPENDEN, HERTFORDSHIRE.

The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies. Edited by L. W. TANCOCK and A. GILLIES. Vols IX-X Cambridge: University Press. 1939-40. vi+188 and vi+142 pp. 8s. 6d. each.

The editorial policy favours classified lists of books and articles dealing with Medieval Latin, Italian, French, Spanish and German studies, though there are still some discursive appreciations of the course taken by research, such as were customary in the first epoch of this periodical. The poverty which dogs modern scholarship has forced the editors to cut down the pagination to about 150 pages (as well as to issue the tenth volume in paper covers), and in this they seem to have been aided chiefly by the withering of humane studies under the shadow of impending war. Only Italian publications have maintained their flow. Hispanic studies have touched a nadir from which they may be expected to rise, but those of the French and German fields are likely to become still more exiguous. The change from discursive article to classified list does not itself save space, since the very small type used for the bibliographies in the former treatment was a device for packing a vast amount of detailed information into a very small compass. The lists, however, probably represent an economy of effort for the compilers, and are of easy use by those who know what it is they seek.

No gratitude can be too high for the experts who have undertaken the exacting toil of preparing this work. It has survived a decade of disappointing reception thanks to the generous conviction of the contributors that they are doing a service to their fellow students. We have reason particularly to be grateful for the energy and enthusiasm of the Editors, the greater part of whose work does not show in print. Not only is there a heavy burden of correspondence and proof-correcting, but the Editors have to show great skill and resource in filling awkward gaps. Thus, Dr Tancock had to supply information about French Romanticism in the Seventeenth Century in one year, but on the Eighteenth Century in another—a feat clearly impossible were his knowledge not as flexible as it is intensive.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

The Growth of Literature By H. M. and N. K. CHADWICK. I. The Ancient Literatures of Europe (Greek, Irish, Welsh, Anglo-Saxon, Norse); II. Russian Oral Literature, Yugoslav Oral Poetry, Early Indian Literature, Early Hebrew Literature; III. The Tatars, Polynesia, the Sea Dyaks, African Peoples, and a General Survey. Cambridge: University Press. 1932-40. xx+672, xvii+783, xxvi+928 pp. 95s.

The Growth of Literature is one of the greatest achievements of English scholarship. One hardly knows whether to admire more heartily the vastness or the firmness of its construction. The Cambridge University Press has gained a reputation for its syndicated encyclopedias, but this work has the dimensions of an encyclopedia and the unity of a single thought. The authors' combined linguistic skill has enabled them to know at first hand the evidence for fully half of the literatures under their

review; and as for the others, their very existence would only be known by a kind of research. All this tremendous mass of information from three continents is co-ordinated under a sound and adequate plan.

We have already heard a good deal about the birth of literature or of individual genres from those who rush in where angels fear to tread. Professor and Mrs Chadwick are not concerned with the absolute primitive, but with the dark period of growth which precedes written literature. It is a period full of disputes and conjectures wherever we turn, so that diametrically opposite conclusions have been drawn from the same wayward indications. What actually occurred in the undocumented period of any given literature may be undiscoverable; but a sufficiently wide comparison should show what sort of account is the most probable. Such a comparison should be widely representative, and its divisions should be as nearly autonomous as may be. This autonomy is to be found in the ancient literatures of Europe, which have left behind them a considerable mass of prose and poetry in later written forms. In two modern European literatures the mass, especially of verse, in oral form is still immense, and it seems to be divorced in practice from the written literature of chroniclers and pious authors. Two ancient literatures of Asia duplicate the experiment of the first part. The civilization of the Tatars is based on oral transmission, though there are written literatures near at hand. The evidence from Polynesia and Africa deals with oral literature wholly unaffected by writing. Other literatures could, no doubt, have been brought forward. The authors mention the Chinese which, beginning apparently as incantations on tripods and strips of bamboo, has had from the first a bizarre originality. The ancient Peruvians had an oral literature which is known at second hand with some fullness, and they present the peculiarity of total severance from the rest of the inhabited world. On the other hand, there are omissions which will strike some readers forcibly: Latin, Old French, the vast region of conjectures that Germanists describe as *Deutsche Heldensagen* (which is represented almost only by the Norse forms in this work). Still there had to be selection; and the reader's feeling is that of being drenched by a deluge of documents.

The autonomy of the various departments of this enquiry may sometimes be questioned. Between Russian *byliny* and Tatar heroic songs there is striking resemblance as to style and manners. In part it is due to the admitted Tatarization of the medieval Russians, but there may be more direct contacts still. The Tatar legends are surprisingly modern. In the intermediate region of the Caucasus, where Tatars, Georgians, Russians and other pulverized fragments of races meet, Russian scholars have discovered poems and tales precisely parallel to the *byliny*; and some have been tempted to give to Russian heroic oral poetry a Tatar origin. Similarly, the growth of Yugoslav balladry may have been conditioned by the literature of Byzantium, both courtly and oral, and by certain influences from Venice and Italy. That there may have been such links of union is not overlooked by the authors themselves. They admit that a possible thesis would derive all heroic epics ultimately from

one centre, say Mesopotamia. Little is known of Homer, for instance, but we do know that he held the Sidonians in respect; fragments of Phoenician epics have come to light, and are themselves probably related to those of Babylon. Still, the tremendous gaps in time between the various efflorescences of such poetry are arguments against a single point of origin; and it is quite reasonable to take the evidence at face value, and make direct comparisons.

These comparisons are ordered by types, lettered from A to E. They are: (A) narrative poetry or saga intended for entertainment, (B) poetry (rarely prose) in the form of speeches in character; (C) poetry or prose intended for instruction, (D) poetry (seldom prose) of celebration or appeal, especially panegyrics, elegies, hymns, prayers, and exhortations; (E) personal poetry (rarely prose) relating to the author himself and his surroundings. An interesting conclusion is that A possibly rises out of D in the case of the great historical epics. Panegyrics and elegies are fitted to preserve names and events from oblivion. An alternative account of the epos is to suppose that it was preceded by 'sagas', i.e. by traditional prose narratives. The living conditions of a 'Heroic Age' prove to be generally similar in all parts, so that we can distinguish between an earlier and a later phase. Thus the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are both typical of later heroic construction, while the *Odyssey* even verges on the post-heroic. The attraction of secondary episodes into the saga of a hero, the use of sequels and preliminaries, and the nature of epic expansion generally, is illustrated with a wealth of instances. I cite the epos, because it is the department most likely to call attention; but Professor and Mrs Chadwick, especially in the later books, do not give it undue prominence. They pay equal attention to antiquarian pieces, gnomic poetry, mantic literature, descriptive verse, and 'timeless, nameless' traditions.

The conclusions of this book affect all our studies, but they are specifically affected by certain sections only. In the first book the treatment of Old English and Old Norse will interest specialist supporters of this *Review*, and in the third there is a somewhat unlooked for appearance of English and Scottish ballad poetry, between the Tuaregs and the General Conclusions. The others lie outside our specialized interests, but some recent experience may justify my risking the judgment that the Russian and Yugoslav sections are the best things we have in any language on those themes. In the other departments experts, however erudite, cannot fail to gain new enlightenment from viewing their studies, so to say, *sub specie aeternitatis*.

Each treatise includes sections on the preservation of the texts, recitation and composition, and authorship. After the first volume there are a number of sectional bibliographies, and the notes throughout provide an infinity of references.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Harrap's Standard French and English Dictionary. Edited by J. E. MANSION. Part II: English-French. London: Harrap, 1939. xii + 1488 pp. 63s.

Having already said our say in our review of vol. I, we need but add now that the companion volume is worthy of its predecessor. It supercedes all existing English-French Dictionaries and, if kept up to date, is not likely to be itself superseded.

The only work with which it can be usefully compared is vol. I. It is yet fuller—about half as long again—and its accuracy is even more unassailable. Its fulness is such that readers who have failed to find a word in vol. I, e.g. *angoura*, should consult vol. II before losing hope. Its length—there are 88,000 entries—is not surprising, since English has a much more extensive vocabulary than French. On its accuracy we can only say that we have regularly consulted it for several months, and find no fault in it, or none that can be fairly imputed to a lexicographer of the present day.

We have not, however, 'read' it with the same pleasure as vol. I, or even with the same profit. Its value is naturally greater for French people. They will find in it the meaning of all English words and phrases for which they can conceivably wish to consult a Dictionary—from 'retractable undercarriage', 'smart get-away', 'power-to-weight ratio' to 'Brobdingnagian', 'Wardour Street' and 'the Carlton Club'. But they will also find that Mr Mansion tends—often of course inevitably—to explain rather than to translate.

English people who require the exact French counterpart of 'retractable undercarriage', etc. will rejoice in the technical terms with which every page positively bristles. But sad will be the disappointment of any who may have hoped that with the appearance of vol. II translation into French would become a simpler affair, that in order to translate a word or a phrase they would only have to 'look it up in Mansion'. Henceforth translators will have less trouble over a particular word, especially a technical one, in a straightforward English sentence, and they will often find a happy rendering of a phrase, though less often perhaps than in vol. I. But English with a little 'style' in it will be as difficult to translate as ever.

Modern lexicography, even on this splendid scale, has its limitations. The fact none the less remains that in his twenty years' labour on these two epoch-making volumes Mr Mansion has done more than any living scholar to establish the precise equivalence of French and English terms.

R. L. G. RITCHIE.

BIRMINGHAM.

Ansej's de Mes, according to MS. N (Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 3143).
Edited by HERMAN J. GREEN. Paris. 1939. 458 pp.

Paulin Paris, writing of the Cycle des Loherains, and in particular of *Ansej's de Mes*, calls the *geste* 'une des plus intéressantes que puisse offrir la littérature primitive d'aucun peuple'. He continues: 'La geste

lorraine serait d'un secours inappréciable pour la topographie... de la Lorraine, de l'Artois et de la Picardie'.¹ The story of the great feud between the Loherains and the Bordelais-Flamands is indeed characterized by unusual realism, and contains, moreover, many accurate references to the North and East of France, and to places in that region full of poignant associations to French and British readers of the present time.

The fourth and last branch of the Cycle, the *Anseys de Mes*, is here published for the first time in its entirety, apparently from a photostatic copy of the MS. N. (ff. 139-188). There are eleven introductory chapters, preceded by a very necessary genealogical table of the two families celebrated in the *chanson*, and by a bibliography of great variety.

As a background to the *Anseys*, and for the first time in one work, a complete summary, based entirely on N, is given of the whole cycle, the story of the quarrel between the two great families, rival followers of king Pépin. The *Anseys* itself is then more fully analysed, according to the three parts into which it falls. That these three divisions may originally have formed three distinct poems is suggested by excisions in the MS., as well as by the summary of events given by the poet. This composite character is seen not to interfere with the unity of effect, which is supplied by the antagonism between the two families, related by marriage, but divided by undying hatred and warfare. As Ferdinand Lot had already pointed out,² this is not a conflict between Gallo-Roman and Germanic neighbours, but a rivalry between two powerful feudal houses, the story of which seems to contain echoes of contemporary events, perhaps even reflections of an age-long conflict between rival linguistic groups. As for the whole MS., Dr Green thinks that it originally consisted of three parts, the third being a shorter *Anseys*, ending with the reconciliation of the protagonists Loeys and Anseys, but that the scribe, when he obtained other texts telling of the downfall of the Loherain line, decided to present the cycle in four branches of approximately equal length. The last part of N appears to favour the Bordelais-Flemings rather than the Loherains, perhaps to conciliate the powerful Counts of Flanders. N is the only MS. which contains all the four branches.

Turning to the literary aspects of the *Anseys*, Dr Green is impressed with the dignity of the characters, Anseys obsessed by the idea of vengeance, Ludie almost a Lady Macbeth. There is no 'belle Aude', but women lamenting over their dead husbands perhaps show the influence of romances, such as those popularized by Chrétien de Troyes (l. 2072, 'Maudite soit Mors qui tant est hardie!'). Almost unique in O.F. epic is the appearance of an army of women, a trait which Gaston Paris, in another connexion, thought to be 'un des rares débris des traditions germaniques'.

A list is given of the other MSS. of the *Anseys* story, and two have been specially compared with N, the first of these, L (B.N. 24377), from a transcription, the second, M (B.N. 1622) from the edition by Mitchneck.

¹ In *Hist. litt. de la France*, t. xxii, 640

² In *Études d'Histoire au Moyen Âge*, p. 213.

Facts emerging from the research of Stengel and his students influenced Dr Green in selecting these two for collation. He believes M, the shortest of the three, to be the oldest and the nearest to the primitive version. He also, following Huet (*Romania* XXI, 360 ff.), examines the character of the only known translation of the story, the *Anseys-Yon* of the Dutch fragments, which Huet derives from a lost French model.

In order to determine the date of the *Anseys*, the editor studies the language of the first 3000 lines, because here N differs radically from any other extant version. The forms and versification (where the author can be detected behind the scribe of the fourteenth century), as well as the literary characteristics and the historical echoes, suggest the end of the twelfth century. The forms are predominantly Francien, while showing obvious influences from other dialects (Picard, Walloon, Lorraine). The decasyllabic verses are far more often linked by rhyme than by assonance.

The text is followed by Notes, elucidating a few obscure passages, by an Index of Proper Names and by a Glossary containing the more unusual words and forms. A few misprints have been overlooked. Attention may be drawn to the doubtful suggestion on p. 70 of 'a elmes' (with helmets) for 'a esmes' (=approximately). On p. 432 I should read 'connoissance', and surmise that the editor has taken for an *e* or a *c* the sign *g*, often used (as he notes on p. 431) as an abbreviation for *con*.

The *Anseys de Mes* is judicious and will be found to be carefully documented. It should form a valuable contribution to studies in Old French Epic.

F. C. JOHNSON.

EDINBURGH.

Histoire de la Pléiade. By HENRI CHAMARD. 2 vols. Paris. H. Didier. 1939. ix + 380 and 401 pp. 140 fr.

Après tant d'études, dont certaines sont si remarquables, consacrées aux divers poètes de la Renaissance française, une histoire générale de tout le mouvement restait encore à faire. M. H. Chamard s'est courageusement chargé de cette besogne ardue: nul n'était mieux qualifié pour la mener à bien que l'auteur du brillant ouvrage sur Joachim du Bellay et de tant d'excellents travaux sur le xvi^e siècle. Les deux premiers volumes¹ de cette histoire viennent de paraître; ils ne déçoindront personne de ceux qui, à un titre ou à un autre, s'intéressent à cette si passionnante époque. La science si sûre et si étendue de l'auteur, son goût très fin, son esprit de mesure se font sentir à chacune des pages qu'il a écrites; on remarquera peut-être surtout l'étude d'ensemble qu'il a consacrée (vol. I) au lyrisme pur de la Pléiade, ou encore certaines pages magistrales sur les *Regrets* de J. du Bellay ou les *Discours* de Ronsard. On goûtera peut-être moins sa critique un peu dure de la *Cléopâtre* de Jodelle; malgré tous ses défauts, trop évidents, cette tragédie a le mérite, qu'on ne retrouvera plus avant Corneille, d'être essentiellement ce que la tragédie française était appelée à devenir: le développement,

¹ Nous espérons qu'il y aura au moins un troisième volume.

encore bien maladroit, certes, d'une crise. Espérons que, lorsqu'il en viendra à la *Didon*, l'auteur montrera plus de sympathie et de justice à l'égard de Jodelle.

Ce dernier point, du reste, n'est qu'un mince détail. Il serait peut-être possible de critiquer plus justement le plan même de M. Chamard; ce dernier a prévu le reproche, qui nous semble un peu spécieux, que l'on pourrait faire à son ouvrage, et il y a répondu à l'avance. On pourrait en effet faire valoir que la Pléiade est un groupement à la fois variable et légèrement hétéroclite; certains poètes ont, pendant quelque temps, été considérés comme faisant partie du groupe, puis en ont été éliminés sans raison très évidente. Guillaume des Autelz, par exemple, a été, on peut le dire, un membre de la première heure, puis a été remplacé par Jacques Peletier qui lui-même a cédé la place à Dorat. On peut vraiment se demander s'il est possible de traiter comme un tout un groupement aussi peu stable et aussi artificiel. Cette objection n'est pas sans fondement; mais n'a-t-on pas pu écrire légitimement l'histoire d'écoles encore moins homogènes que ne le fut la Pléiade, l'école romantique par exemple? Ce qui étonne toutefois c'est que, ayant prévu cette objection, M. Chamard ait prêté le flanc à la critique en éliminant de son ouvrage Guillaume des Autelz, alors qu'il accorde une place assez considérable, et méritée, à Jacques Peletier et qu'il étudie certains recueils de Pontus de Tyard antérieurs à l'entrée de celui-ci dans le mouvement. Il y a là, sinon de l'incohérence, du moins un certain arbitraire. Enfin, on ne manquera pas de regretter que le sujet et le titre de l'ouvrage aient condamné l'auteur à exclure Amadys Jamyn, O. de Magny, et surtout du *Bartas* et d'Aubigné.

Chaque auteur, il est vrai, a le droit de délimiter son terrain comme il l'entend; et, au lieu de chicaner M. Chamard sur son sujet même, nous lui ferons une autre critique. Loin de le trouver trop hardi, nous lui reprocherions de n'avoir pas montré assez d'audace. Son premier volume nous a semblé de tout point excellent: l'auteur y groupe les ouvrages qu'il étudie au point de vue logique, tout en s'astreignant à un rigoureux ordre chronologique. Chacun des points qu'il examine—le pétrarquisme, le lyrisme de la Pléiade etc.—forme un tout où chaque auteur a la place qui lui revient. Le second volume, à ce point de vue, est beaucoup moins satisfaisant: il suffit d'en parcourir la table des matières pour en retirer une impression très nette de décousu: la *Cléopâtre*¹ avoisine les *Antiquitez* de du Bellay, celles-ci précèdent l'*Art Poétique* de Jacques Peletier, Anacréon suit l'*Art Poétique* et il en va ainsi tout le long du volume. L'ordre purement chronologique a fait grand tort à l'ordre logique, s'il ne l'a pas tout à fait déplacé. Ceci gâte un peu notre plaisir et nous fait regretter la belle ordonnance du premier volume.

F. J. TANQUEREY.

LONDRES.

¹ On attendait ici une étude sur la *Didon*, comme au chapitre suivant une étude sur l'*Art Poétique* de Ronsard.

Lamartine, l'homme et l'œuvre. By M. GUILLEMIN. Paris: Beivin. 1940. 165 pp. 15 fr

M. Guillemin's study of Lamartine is a very capable piece of work; he has told the touching and familiar life-story with dignity and sympathy and compressed much accurate biographical data into an incredibly small compass. Literary criticism inevitably suffers in the process and tends to be obscured by detail, even perverted, in the lengthy survey of 'la pensée religieuse'. Convicted by his own verse, quoted in evidence against him, the singer of Elvire emerges finally an emasculated *Vicaire Savoyard*, possibly a Voltairian Milton, for, in driving home his thesis, M. Guillemin has lost sight of the poet.

This thesis is twofold: Lamartine belongs to the eighteenth century by his thought and his art; in religion he is a rationalistic deist. This is very true, but, if we set out to find only this in Lamartine's poetical work, it reduces that work mainly to *Jocelyn* and *La Chute d'un Ange*, hardly a title to posthumous glory, even to remembrance. And when M. Guillemin says of the *Méditations*: 'Lamartine est l'homme de ce livre, presque uniquement, pour les Français de son temps et pour beaucoup d'âmes encore dans la postérité', the implication is that discriminating posterity will and should look elsewhere for the complete poetic revelation. But it is always dangerous to simplify a poet's thought into a system; Lanson's words on this very point are there to remind us: 'la personnalité poétique et la personnalité pratique ne coïncident pas exactement . . . il est sans doute téméraire de vouloir définir trop rigoureusement le sens du mot *raison* pour Lamartine'. By his insistence on the poet's rationalism, M. Guillemin has neglected a more obvious aspect of Lamartine's religious inspiration, which is also an essential part of his poetic genius, an aspect expressed with great intensity in the *Lettre à M. d'Esgrigny*. This religion of his *personnalité poétique* is identical with what Pater calls 'the religion of Numa, a religion of usages and sentiments rather than of facts and beliefs and attached to very definite things and places'. In Lamartine it is the *religio* inspired by communion with spots hallowed by memory and association: 'les anciens avaient senti et exprimé ce mystère. Ils disaient *genius loci*: l'âme du lieu; ils avaient les *dieux lares*, la divinité du foyer. Cette divinité s'est réfugiée aujourd'hui dans le cœur'; and, at the close of the same *Lettre*, the poet goes to pay homage to his departed ancestors in this spirit: 'je vais seul à la chute du jour, dire à genoux un salut ou un adieu à ces chers hôtes de l'éternelle paix'. It is the spirit which animates the whole of *Milly ou la Terre natale*:

Objets inanimés avez-vous donc une âme
Qui s'attache à notre âme et la force d'aimer?

It is here we see Lamartine's true religion rather than in his deism or his hectic quest of a faith he could neither conceive nor formulate, and here, at the same time, is the genuine poetic experience. But, although one would like to see this point made, its absence must not be allowed to detract from M. Guillemin's careful and exact scholarship. He is an

acknowledged authority on *Jocelyn* and all that he has to say about it is perspicacious and revealing.

L. A. BISSON.

OXFORD.

Introduction à l'étude des écrivains français d'aujourd'hui. By DANIEL MORNET. PARIS: Boivin. 1939. 203 pp. 20 fr.

This is not the book for the student in a hurry, who wants to 'get up' contemporary French literature and has no time for study of the authors' original works. Such a student would of course learn a great deal (he could not do otherwise with such a guide), but he would miss the real value of M. Mornet's excellent volume, for it is a thoughtful commentary rather than an introduction. The better-prepared student, who has already made direct contact with contemporary prose-writers and dramatists discussed in it (the poets have been left aside), will find it informative, interesting and, indeed, illuminating. M. Mornet, instead of dealing successively with individuals, groups or movements, examines contemporary French literature as it were thematically, illuminating the whole field from various angles. 'le monde intérieur, le monde extérieur, la mission de l'écrivain; la faculté dominante, le choix des objets, l'ordonnance des objets; la part de l'intelligence, la passion ou la possession, le commandement de la beauté'. By this method the various facets of each work or author come in turn under the beam of the X-ray lamp. Gradually we discover not only the individual patterns but the continuity existing in the general pattern of French literature and underlying the coruscating novelties of modernism. 'Presque tous les romans, toutes les pièces de théâtre ou même les poèmes qui paraissent devoir survivre à d'éphémères engouements n'ont pas conçu les divertissements de l'imagination, les songes lyriques autrement que des romantiques, des Parnassiens, des Symbolistes' (p. 96). No one can read this stimulating book without getting a truer perspective of the subject, nor without enjoying the richness of the texture afforded by M. Mornet's lightly-worn erudition, his enlightening parallels and his sound judgment. It is a book which provokes meditation, a 'professorial' work in the best sense of the word.

F. C. ROE.

ABERDEEN.

The Study of the Nibelungenlied, being the History of the Study of the Epic and Legend from 1755 to 1937. By MARY THORP. (*Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature.*) Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1940. vi + 196 pp. 12s. 6d.

Miss Thorp is here the historian of a branch of scholarship to which she herself has already contributed (cf. *Journal of Engl. and Germ. Philology*, vols. xxxvi and xxxvii). She deals in Part I of the present work with 'The study of the *Nibelungenlied*, of its story and form, and the evolution of the theories concerning it' (that is, roughly, 'from Lachmann to Heusler'); Part II traces the views which have been held, or are now held,

on the relationship of the *Nibelungen* manuscripts (her actual heading is 'The development in the manuscript criticism'), Part III gives a number of useful bibliographies. In the arduous task of mustering the evidence relevant to her history of *Nibelungen* research Miss Thorp has acquitted herself well: herein lies the real value of the work, from which the criticisms made below shall not detract. That nothing positively new could be said of the contributions of earlier and more recent investigators was to be expected, and Miss Thorp's judgments are—her enthusiasm for her subject cannot conceal the fact—those conventionally accepted; apart from a strange insistence on a fundamental resemblance between the theories of Lachmann and Heusler, she has no axe to grind.

It is the formal shortcomings of the work which must receive the severest criticism. To the actual writing of the book the authoress has evidently given little care. The title ignores nearly half the contents of the book, the headings of the first two sections (reproduced above) are very poorly worded, the writer's English style verges, at times, on the grotesque. In Miss Thorp's own interest the editor should have insisted on a complete revision of the work from the point of view of style.¹ There are grammatical and logical solecisms, glaring misprints and technical blemishes which the people responsible for the publication should have rectified before the book was released.²

F. P. PICKERING.

MANCHESTER.

Problems in German Literary History of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. By ARCHER TAYLOR. New York: Modern Language Association of America; London: Oxford University Press. 1939. 209 pp. 12s.

This is a most suggestive book and of a most unusual kind. It might be called an exploratory bibliography with a limited objective. The author views the period as a geographer might view the map of some little known country, selecting some more or less blank area for exploration, suggesting, on a basis of valid experience, the probable course that discovery will take and making a well-planned and systematic approach to the obstacles which intervene.

¹ The expressions 'rule of verse ownership' (pp. 57, 58) and 'the law of the non-borrowing of the strophic form' (p. 58) have certainly never been heard in English, and require justification. 'Therem, thereof, therefrom' (*passim*) cannot, in modern English, be used as the final word in a sentence. Must one inevitably 'hold theories', 'make suggestions', 'furnish proof' as to...? I would ask the authoress to consider whether the following passages should have been allowed to stand: pp. 17 (ll. 2-5), 36 (last line, to *present day* on 37); 49, ll. 1-9, 51, ll. 11-12 from the bottom; 54, ll. 2-8, 55, ll. 22-3, 60, ll. 3-4 of last paragraph, 135, second paragraph.

² Cf. note 1, together with the following points. The title J. Korner, *Nibelungenforschungen der deutschen Romantik*, Leipzig, 1911, is given in full for the sixth time on p. 36. The use of 'continuous syntax'—which enables the writer to weave German quotations into the fabric of her narrative—is ugly, it is sometimes misapplied (pp. 49, 52), and on one occasion leads to a startling result: 'the authors having... interpolated... eine Anzahl Strophen der Bearbeitung Yem'... (p. 140). How, please, does one parse 'in the case of such MSS. descent' and 'with regard to the MSS. judgment' (pp. 129, 130)?

Mr Taylor chooses his period on the ground that its literature reflects movements which, while profoundly affecting mankind, are as yet only imperfectly understood. In the second place, he considers the period attractive because 'research in it can be undertaken and carried to a successful conclusion with simple means', though here it must be added that he addresses himself chiefly to research students in the United States. In indicating subjects for research he has preferred those which lie within well-defined limits rather than others which would open too wide a field of knowledge or for which the necessary instruments of research are not easily accessible. He does not claim to do more than provide 'a superficial survey of a vast field'.

The plan of the book embraces four chapters: 1, General Problems. 2, Problems in the Study of an Author; 3, Problems in the Literary History of a Genre, and 4, Problems in the History of Ideas. Of the nine sections of Chapter I, we may perhaps take No. 8—Literary Influence shown by Translations—as a fair sample of Mr Taylor's matter and method. 'What works are translated', he asks. 'When do the translations of a particular author begin to appear? Can we, for example, fix the beginning of the vogue of translations of Greek drama? Where are the translations made? What cultural influences led to making them?' We need a list of contemporary translations from the classics, including the translations from Greek into Latin. This argument is pointed with a reference to the importance of Erasmus' Latin translation of the New Testament. We need, further, a list of translations into German from Italian, French, Spanish, and Dutch. We need a tabulation of the discovery in or introduction to Germany of manuscripts of classical writers. We need studies on the principles and methods of German translators.

In the second section of Chapter II—The Biography, Bibliography, and Editing of an Author—Mr Taylor notes that neither Sebastian Brant, Johannes Geiler von Kaisersberg, nor Johann Eck has so far received adequate biographical treatment and that American resources are probably sufficient to provide for Geiler.

Chapter III is extremely rich in detailed suggestion. Section 24, for example, explores 'The Literary History of Jest-Books'. Annotated editions are plentiful, but a few gaps remain to be filled. Frischlin's *Facetiae*, Brant's *Liber faceti*, and the influence of the German jest-book on the Netherlands and Scandinavia.

The title of Chapter IV—Problems in the History of Ideas—promises rather more than is actually supplied, as it deals with four subjects only: Ideas of Marriage, Handbooks on Marriage, Devil Literature, and The History of Literature and the History of Art, of which the first two together cover eighteen closely printed pages and the last two seven only. We need, *inter alia*, says Mr Taylor, a satisfactory history of post-mediaeval German guides to marriage, an investigation of the married life of Hans Sachs, and of the influence of Greek and Latin treatises on German books on marriage. Why did Devil Literature flourish in Eastern Germany? Did Luther's views on the Devil interrupt the development of fool-literature? Have we an exhaustive iconographic history of the

Devil? Do we yet understand the interrelations of mysticism and art? Mr Taylor suggests scores of questions and brings his work to an abrupt stop, not because the material is exhausted but because he believes he has given the discerning reader a sufficient idea of the problems in German literature of the period and of the ways and means to solve them. He supplies five specimen critical bibliographies—'History of Strassburg', 'Privately owned German Libraries of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', 'The Language of German Hunters', 'The City Poem', 'The History of Marriage'—a complete index of the subjects mentioned in the text, and an index of proper names.

The only possible preparation for a really critical review of this book would be two or three years' practical use of it. For the present, it is safe to say that any student of the period who does not avail himself of the guidance here offered will place himself at a great disadvantage.

G. WATERHOUSE.

BELFAST.

German Lyrics of the Seventeenth Century. By A. CLOSS and W. F. MAINLAND. London: Duckworth. 1940. xvii + 94 pp. 6s.

It was a happy thought to bring out an anthology of German seventeenth-century lyric poetry as a pendant to Dr Closs's *Genius of the German Lyric*, especially now when Germany has broken with so much of her past. The aim of the editors has been not so much to pull out plums as to display a wide range of poets, of styles and of themes. Their problem is that the German seventeenth century is not easy to illustrate in small compass. Outstanding figures are few and minor poets many. Hence, except for Weckherlin, Opitz, Fleming, Hofmannswaldau and Gryphius, most poets are represented in the selection by one poem apiece, not enough to give a clear image of a personality. Inevitably one thinks that certain favourites are underrepresented. It seems a pity, for instance, to limit Logau to three aphorisms on the ground that he is not strictly speaking a lyric poet. Quite an important place in the seventeenth century is held by the satiric, didactic, epigrammatic genre. Yet, when these small reservations are made, one finds on laying down the volume that certain seventeenth-century trends stand out in clear relief. Religious poetry has never been excelled by later inspiration and ranges from grand hymns like 'O Haupt vol blut und Wunden' [*sic*], which will live as long as there is congregational singing, to mystic broodings which stray over into the heretical, the difference between Catholic and Protestant being of secondary importance. The love song is perhaps what is most remote from us to-day, being either sensual or artificial or both, and devoid, except for Anke van Tharau, of the 'Herzenstöne' of later centuries. There is less feeling for nature than in the medieval lyric. A few of the poems deal with more or less contemporary themes, battles, the anguish of the Thirty Years' War, The Winterkönig, Agnes von Bernauer, etc.

On the formal side the seventeenth century is the century of artifice

of all kinds, ranging from verbal conceits to poems built to form patterns on the printed page. These are adequately illustrated in the present selection, though the reader would have been grateful for more guidance in the introduction as to the foreign affinities of the different varieties of conceit. Some idea is given of Italian and French influences at work in the century, but a word would have been welcome about the debt to Holland in this supreme century of Dutch influence in Europe.

Spelling and punctuation in many cases are reproduced from seventeenth-century editions, though in some cases they are modernized or normalized. The arrangement is a loose one, neither strictly chronological nor by themes. One or two names are introduced for the first time to modern readers.

I. M. MASSEY.

LONDON.

The Cyclical Method of Composition in Gottfried Keller's Sinngedicht. By PRISCILLA M. KRAMER. New York: New York University. (*Ottendorfer Memorial Series of Germanic Monographs* No. 26.) 1939. vii+318 pp.

Keller's *Sinngedicht*, as Miss Kramer points out in this monograph, cannot adequately be described as a framed story; it is more than that, for an organic relationship exists between the group of seven tales forming the 'picture' itself, and the enclosing 'frame', which announces the central theme. This deals with the problem of harmonizing the conflicting impulses aroused by love, and all seven tales form variations on it. The task which the hero of the introductory 'frame-story' sets himself at the beginning is the solution of this problem, and it is accomplished only in the last pages of the whole work, when he finds the woman in whom the senses and moral conventions are finely balanced; so that, by implication, he must have attained that balance himself, to inspire it in her by his advances.

Miss Kramer's main purpose is to show with almost mathematical precision the part played by the seven enclosed stories in the development of this theme. It is usual to call such a group of tales a cycle, but here it is insisted that the *Sinngedicht* is cyclical in the narrower sense of the dictionary's definition of 'a course of operations returning into itself'. Now it seems an arbitrary interpretation of the achievement of a definite object which has been merely proposed, or discerned from the start, to visualize it exclusively as a return to the point of departure. But if Miss Kramer's interpretation is once conceded, then the geometrical diagram with which she illustrates it must be acknowledged as a useful guide to Keller's elaborate methods of composition. Going beyond the initial assumption of a merely circular line of development, it shows the progression of the theme as 'a "spiral" route round about a significant and illuminating central idea', the spirals being formed by seven small rounds (representing the enclosed tales) intersecting one another, and placed at equal distances from the centre of the great circle, whose

circumference describes the cyclical shape of the whole work. This diagrammatical interpretation is supported by so exhaustive an analysis of the *Sinngedicht* and its endlessly recurring themes that only Keller's notoriously unspontaneous technique could support or justify it. As it is, the minute documentation impressively emphasizes Keller's fidelity in the general construction of his *Sinngedicht* (which may well be taken as characteristic of his work) to the same principles of prearranged form as the textual appendices to Jonas Fränkel's edition show him to have observed in his almost interminable stylistic revisions of individual sentences.

R. TYMMS.

MANCHESTER.

SHORT NOTICES

Dr Tarquinio Vallese, who is already responsible for an edition of Chaucer's *Clerk's Tale*, in making his edition of a Middle English collection of Medical Recipes (*Un Ignoto Ricettario Medico Inglese del XIV Secolo*. Naples: Dino Amodio. 1940. 66 pp. 20 L.), has failed to show any competence for his task. His introduction, which purports to give a general sketch of the Middle English language and its literature, includes such statements as 'the *Ancren Ryle* is a poem of 10,000 lines', or that the late Middle English period is the 'period of Chaucerian prose'. On the other hand, we are told nothing concerning the language of the text published by him or its importance, philological or otherwise.

Concerning the MS. which contains the *Ricettario*, we are told that it was 'trovato nella Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli' where it bears the shelfmark xiii. B. 29, that it was written in 1457, and that it belonged to the famous Italian philosopher Tommaso Campanella. The photographic reproductions show the handwriting of the MS. as a typical English cursive hand of the middle of the fifteenth century; hence one cannot see on what grounds the text, which incidentally is one of those collections of Recipes which are such a frequent feature amongst Middle English writings, has been attributed, as in the title, to the fourteenth century.

The reproductions which accompany Dr Vallese's transcript of the MS. disclose the editor's lack of accuracy. His inaccuracies, faulty transcriptions, omissions of words, etc. are so frequent that his text becomes worthless. I have noticed fourteen grave faults in the first page of the text, and a similar quota of mistakes is maintained throughout. The only section of this work which might prove of some use are the photostatic reproductions of the MS., but even these are often illegible.

R. WEISS.

LONDON.

In *Milton's Rhetoric: Studies in his Defense of Liberty* (University of Missouri Studies, xiv, 3. Columbia, Missouri. 1939. 193 pp. \$1.25) Dr W. E. Gilman subjects six of Milton's controversial pamphlets

(*Areopagitica*, *Of Education*, *Of Reformation*, *Of Civil Power*, *The Tenure*, *The Ready and Easie Way*) to an exact and thorough analysis in terms of background, ideas and structure, logical, pathetic, ethical, and non-artistic proof. His purpose is to show how Milton employs the classical principles of rhetoric in dealing with practical problems; and though his method involves somewhat tedious repetitions, one perceives that Milton's controversial prose is less disorderly than is sometimes supposed, that he was capable of varying his methods to suit particular situations, that occasionally—though perhaps less frequently than Dr Gilman suggests—he consciously made use of rhetorical devices. The choice and arrangement of pamphlets seems arbitrary. The Latin defences, for example, are more distinctly rhetorical than any of those selected. An attempt to indicate the development of Milton's technique (if not of his ideas) might have been valuable. Dr Gilman provides a convenient summary, but he confines himself rigorously to an examination of each of his pamphlets in turn and refuses to generalize. His analyses make one wish for some account of the general principles Milton followed in this 'graceful and ornate' art, and of the 'subtle and fine' qualities he attributed to it. This may subsequently be forthcoming, for the present revision of his doctoral thesis is but a part of the study Dr Gilman projects. If he dared to summarize less and to generalize more, one might not have the sense of missing the flexible power of art and nature Milton had in mind when he wrote of a related subject: '...quibus enim ingenium per se viget atque pollet, iis ut in hoc genere Analytico cum labore nimio ac miseria se torqueant, non sum author. Ad id enim ars adhibetur, ut naturam juvet, non ut impediat...'

ARTHUR BARKER.

TORONTO.

It was a capital idea to bring together these three essays of Sir William Temple with due annotation and editorial apparatus in Mr F. J. Fielden's edition (*Sir William Temple; Three Essays*. Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, Indian Branch. 1939. xxvi+139 pp. 4s. 6d.). Blackie's *Red Letter Library* offered a wider selection in 1911, but this is now out of print, and Moore Smith's selection from the works covers only the early essays. Temple's misguided intrusion into the Ancients v. Moderns controversy has rescued from oblivion two of his literary essays, *Of Poetry*, given here, and *Ancient and Modern Learning* (Clarendon Press edition, 1909), but apart from that episode he was in danger of being remembered only as Dorothy Osborne's correspondent. No mean fate certainly, but for a man who fancied himself as a patriot and a writer and whose works were pretty regularly edited down to 1814 (the occasion of Charles Lamb's attempt to salvage him)—rather a slight.

One could have no possible quarrel with the selection given us here—*Of Poetry*; *Of Popular Discontents*; and *Of Health and Long Life*, though I confess to a weakness for the essay on *Gardening*. If that had gone in and also the *Ancient and Modern Learning* (if for no other reason than to help us to appreciate Macaulay's heavy banter), Mr Fielden might have

been able to say here is the best of Temple and all that any reasonable reader need know of his essays.

Truth to tell, even those given here, though delectable to the specialist, are rather heavy fare for the common reader. This applies least to the essay *Of Health and Long Life*. For once Sir William is garrulous in the pleasant old seventeenth-century manner (one of our lost arts), and as gullible as that expositor of popular fallacies, Sir Thomas Browne, whose manner intrudes a little here. The *Popular Discontents* to be readable must have the background of seventeenth-century political philosophy, and then it becomes a ripe utterance on the art of government by one who had played his part. The close of it is as modest a valedictory as one would wish to read. *Of Poetry* is likely to prove the toughest of the three, but there is nothing jejune in it to those who know their Renaissance criticism. Mr Fielden's Introduction is informative and sympathetic.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

The scope of *Eighteenth Century English Literature and its Cultural Background. A Bibliography*, by James E. Tobin (New York: Fordham University Press. 1939. x+190 pp. \$2), is of admirable comprehensiveness. It seeks to cover the historical background, 'Social Thought' (society, taste, philosophy, sociological problems and education), memoirs, etc., criticism, general literary matters and so on, and devotes 120 pages to bibliographies of single authors. Attention might be drawn to its inaccuracies, its gaps, its occasional questionable methods of arrangement, but this would be ungracious in view of the debt which every student will owe to its closely packed pages. It is a book that every literary library will need to buy.

G. TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

Professor Harrison's anthology of pastoral elegies, a collection of poems by twenty-three poets arranged in chronological order (*The Pastoral Elegy. An Anthology*. Edited with Introduction, Commentary and Notes by Thomas Perrin Harrison, Jr. English Translations by Harry Joseph Leon. Austin: University of Texas. 1939. xi+312 pp.) which begins with the first *Idyll* of Theocritus and ends with *Thyrsis*, is designed to illustrate the successive phases in the development of the pastoral elegy. The poets and poems chosen are, for the most part, as would be expected. The inclusion of Radbert's *Eclogue by two Nuns* on the death of his master Adelhard as a specimen of pastoral elegy from the Middle Ages calls attention to a poem comparatively obscure but of considerable interest and occasions some suggestive comments on the fusion of classical with Christian themes, a convention which becomes regularized from the Renaissance onwards. Milton is represented by *Epitaphium Damonis* as well as by *Lycidas*, and extracts from the pastorals of Philips and Gay follow Pope's *Winter*. The commentary and notes, while compact, are adequate and well documented. The translator,

perhaps wisely, has been more concerned with accuracy of rendering than with finer points of style, 'Ite domum saturae, venit Hesperus, ite capellae' becoming 'Get along home, my well-fed goats, Hesperus is coming, get along'. Professor Harrison's venture was well worth undertaking, having resulted in a serviceable anthology which would have been still more so had he included the originals of the Greek eclogues as he has included those from other languages.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

LONDON.

Lord David Cecil's anthology of 'Christian Verse' (*The Oxford Book of Christian Verse*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1940. xxxii + 560 pp. 8s. 6d.) inevitably raises questions concerning the selection of poems to make up this rather artificial addition to the Oxford Books of Verse, which already include a book of Mystical Verse. The fact is, of course, that English poetry arises out of, and expresses, a Christian civilization throughout its history. It might, perhaps, be more justifiable, and certainly easier, to make an anthology of non-Christian verse in English. In attempting to segregate poetry more specifically related to religion, the anthologist is almost bound to think mainly in terms of devotional and lyric poetry. Among much in Lord David Cecil's interesting Introduction that arrests the reader with doubts, nothing is more surprising than his dismissal of *Piers Plowman*, and Langland goes unrepresented in his pages, as does *Pearl*. There are, it is true, passages of non-lyric poetry, e.g. from Chaucer, Dryden, Milton and Browning. But there are better examples of Shakespeare's Christianity in his dramatic poetry than the solitary sonnet which here represents this aspect of his verse.

The criterion of 'orthodoxy', again, is one that can only be applied upon the anthologist's own decision. And he makes an exception in favour of Blake. His own sympathies are clearly with that devotional poetry which expresses the spirit of his own Church. And he associates the rise of Christian verse in England with the rise of this Church.

The difficult task has, however, been attempted, with as much success as was possible, with the help of fine taste, wide reading, and deep interest. We could wish that the Introduction had not given such high authority to the use of the jargon phrase 'centres round' (p. xxviii).

C. J. Sisson.

LONDON.

Among the University of Texas *Studies in English* 1938 (Austin: University of Texas. 1938. 205 pp. \$1.00) is a valuable article by H. Ransom dealing with the emergence of the professional author, the creation of his bargaining power by the copyright act of 1710, the growth of the system of royalty, and the financial relations of author to publisher. In an article on *Romeus and Juliet* and the Valentine-Silvia plot in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* Miss M. S. Allen cites many resemblances which, though individually inconclusive, produce a collective impression that Shakespeare had Brooke's poem in mind. E. B. Atwood questions the

validity of Robert Mannyng's citation of *Dares Phrygius* as source for his account of the events leading to the destruction of Troy, and shows exemplary caution in concluding that though Mannyng's account seems to derive from the *Compendium Historiae Trojanae-Romanae*, yet it is possible that he drew not on this but on medieval redactions of a common body of classical material. W. W. Pratt publishes the marginalia in Leigh Hunt's copy of the *Rambler* and discusses what they reveal of Hunt's opinions and his inability to understand the great humanity of Dr Johnson. Pushkin's debt to Byron, Barry Cornwall and Southey in his treatment of Spanish themes is demonstrated by R. C. Stephenson. T. Hornberger shows what evidence of interest in science is afforded by Cotton Mather's annotations on the first chapter of Genesis. Miss A. L. Cooke contributes a keen study of Hawthorne's impressions of Swift.

There remain articles on Poe and Dante, Poe and *I Promessi Sposi*, Paul Hayne's reputation in Augusta, the *Reeve's Tale* in the hands of a N. Midland scribe, and a glossary of Shakespeare's hawking language which is marred by the facile conjectures of its introduction.

The matter of the book is worthy of a more attractive layout and better printing.

W. M. T. DODDS.

LONDON.

We should like to extend a welcome to two new periodical publications in our field. *Occident* and the *Revista de Filología Hispánica* appeared in Paris and Buenos Aires, respectively, in March 1940 and 1939. The former (12 francs a copy) makes its appeal to the general reader. It includes an essay on Spain by Mr Hilaire Belloc, and a long note on Spanish studies in England by Professor Peers. The *Revista de Filología Hispánica*, edited by Sr Amado Alonso at the Instituto de Filología of Buenos Aires University, has since 1939 issued three numbers. It has the format of the regretted *Revista de Filología Española*, and the first article, by Sr Navarro Tomás on the 'phonic group', emphasized this continuity. The review has strong support from professors in the United States, and is likely to prove more internationally minded than its model. We can expect from it also the important service of setting in order studies of American Spanish phenomena.

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

T. R. Palfrey, J. G. Fucilla and W. C. Holbrook, the compilers of *A Bibliographical Guide to the Romance Languages and Literatures* (Evanston, Illinois: Chandler's. 1939. 82 pp.), modestly disclaim any pretensions to finality and invite suggestions and additions. This consciousness of incompleteness also explains their admirable idea of printing on one side of the page only so that students may use the Guide as a notebook in which further items may be added opposite the appropriate headings. Primarily intended as a handy guide to reference books and periodicals for the student who is embarking on his first piece of

research, the book includes such titles as manuals of thesis-writing and note-taking, standard works of general and literary history as well as the more specialized bibliographies. If anything, the linguistic side is weighted at the expense of the literary, but this handicap to the literary student is more apparent than real, since he is referred, under the suitable subject-headings, to the existing bibliographies such as Thieme or Talvart et Place.

The 1500 entries cover the principal works of reference on the language and literature of France (including Provençal, Belgian and Swiss-French matter), Italy, Spain, Portugal (Catalan and Latin American items are inserted here) and Rumania. Sardinian and Rhaeto-Romance are omitted. Theoretically the objection could be made that the order of the items listed under a given rubric is sometimes alphabetical, sometimes chronological and sometimes from the general to the particular, but this apparent capriciousness justifies itself in practice as the arrangement adopted usually seems to be the most logical and the simplest for the particular topic. The absence of a detailed index is compensated by a thorough system of cross-references, and many entries are supplemented by a line or two of explanatory matter.

L. W. Tancock.

LONDON.

Dans un petit livre, très agréablement présenté, M. M. Françon soulève et effleure, plutôt qu'il ne la traite, la question de la popularité relative des blondes et des brunes au xvi^e siècle en France et en Angleterre (*Notes sur l'Esthétique de la Femme au xvi^e siècle*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1939. 195 pp.). Il montre, ce qui est en somme juste mais assez bien connu, qu'avant le xvi^e siècle les blondes l'emportent sur les brunes dans la tradition littéraire;¹ mais qu'en tout temps les brunes l'ont emporté sur les blondes dans la poésie populaire. Les poètes du xvi^e siècle ont été beaucoup plus vagues ou plus éclectiques. Sur ce point, la documentation de notre auteur reste maigre; on s'étonne qu'il n'ait pas pensé à examiner à ce point de vue les peintres de la Renaissance; les considérations politiques, économiques et sociales auxquelles il se livre manquent de base, parfois de vraisemblance. L'ascension de la bourgeoisie à cette époque est un fait dont personne ne doute, mais on ne voit pas l'influence qu'elle a pu avoir sur les idées—si variables et parfois si déconcertantes—de Ronsard au sujet de la beauté féminine.

F. J. Tanqueray.

LONDRES.

In a dissertation accepted by the Graduate School of New York University Mr Kenneth N. McKee has investigated *The Rôle of the Priest on the Parisian Stage during the French Revolution* (*Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*, xxxvi. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins

¹ Qu'on n'oublie pas cependant que le sujet d'un nombre considérable de chansons de geste est fourni par les amours d'un chevalier français et d'une Sarrazine, dont il serait difficile de faire une blonde.

Press; London. H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1939. 113 pp. + Bibliography and Lists of Plays and Periodicals cited. \$1.25). After a cursory chapter summarizing a few outstanding facts of French Ecclesiastical history pertinent to his subject, the author passes in review about 130 plays—full-dress tragedies like M.-J. Chénier's *Charles IX*, melodramas, vaudevilles and comic operas—in which the ecclesiastic of various grades is made to figure. He carries his study up to the eve of the 18th Brumaire. Certainly the position of the Church in France, the status and utility of its ministers, offered a good deal of material during the Revolutionary years to ephemeral playwrights bent on captivating the public or placating the authorities of the moment. Sentimentality and scurrility are equally abundant. In sifting this trash—he admits it to be such from the literary view-point—Mr McKee, while not altogether avoiding the tedium which his method of recounting plot after plot necessarily entails, has been careful to elicit some interesting conclusions as to the general movement of feeling with regard to the clergy during the successive phases of the Revolution. Hysterical or indecent anticlericalism only raises its head during the Convention period, reaching its climax of violence and absurdity in the vogue of plays on the 'Pope Joan' theme early in 1793. Mr McKee stresses the relative failure of such attacks to find favour with the public, in so far as their early withdrawal, or the reluctance of actors to perform them or of critics to review them, provides evidence for their lack of popularity. Before the Terror the parish priest was singled out as a humanitarian and patriotic figure; after Thermidor he ceases to be an attraction on the stage. For the rest, scheming prelates and lascivious monks hold the glare of the footlights. The theatre of the Revolutionary period can thus be used—with caution—as a sort of barometer for testing public opinion on the religious question.

Could anything more have been made of the subject? Could not a deeper penetration into the material available and a more analytic plan have thrown less meagre light on the status and social role of the French clergy during those perilous years? The answer is probably no. The subject is a disappointing one and the results must be slight. This is not meant as a reproach to the author, who has handled his material with scrupulosity and good sense. Propaganda and not the study of manners is the dominant feature in the Revolutionary theatrical repertory.

H. J. HUNT.

OXFORD.

A short table of figures on p. 116 summarizes the thesis of Sister Mary Paulina St Amour's *Study of the Villancico up to Lope de Vega* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1940. x+131 pp.). Before 1550 the profane *villancicos* exceed the religious ones in number (very much so before 1511). Between 1550–75 the religious ones gain the upper hand, though the figure owes much to a single collection. Between 1575 and 1600 those devoted to Christmas exceed the other religious motives, and this ascendancy has so increased that the term is now chiefly

understood of songs for the Nativity. Sister St Amour does not deal with music. She mentions the theories of origin, and then discusses the topics of the religious and profane songs. It might have been worth while to remember that the Portuguese *Cancioneiros* do contain one *cantiga de vilão*, and that it is quite unlike the *villancicos*. This fact increases the probability that the *villancico* is a Castilian form.

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Harvard has given us a row of tentative bibliographies of the Latin-American literatures, and Professor F. B. Luquens of Yale has countered with a list of *Spanish American Literature in the Yale University Library* (New Haven: Yale University Press, and Oxford University Press. 1939. x+335 pp. 45s.). Periodicals are to form another publication and a third is to have the title *Spanish American Bibliography and Literary Criticism in the Yale University Library*. The three book-lists (of which this one has 5668 entries) will include no more than a fraction of the 40,000 volumes of Latin Americana possessed by that University, covering every variety of interest. Formed to a large extent of donations by four generous givers, the Yale collection is very full, but not complete, especially in the matter of living authors. Mexico is most fully represented, and Peru, Chile, Colombia and Argentina run it close. This volume will be placed beside the two stout volumes in which California University displayed its Hispano-American wealth.

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Professor P. M. Palmer's *Neuweltwörter im Deutschen* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, *Germanische Bibliothek, Untersuchungen und Texte*, 42. 1939. viii+174 pp. 9M.60) is a continuation of the author's *Der Einfluss der Neuen Welt auf den deutschen Wortschatz 1492-1800*. It contains in alphabetical order a list of borrowings from *Alligator* in 1508 to *Curaçao* in 1897. Most of the words have been introduced in descriptions of travels, which are in most cases German translations from Spanish, English, and French travel books—translations from other languages are fewer. These German borrowings thus assume forms determined by the language through which they have been made. Some retain their earliest form (*Chinchilla*), some have assumed a German shape (*Kanu*, which found its way into German through Spanish as *Canoa* in 1520), and some have been influenced by popular etymology (*Hängematte*, which was borrowed as *Hamaca* through Spanish in 1557, and owes its present form to the influence of Dutch).

In his search for these borrowings Professor Palmer has read some 450 books, of which 300 are travel books. In his examples, quotations from travel books are given first, then those from works of other kinds. The author has dealt with 167 words. In each case meaning and etymology are fully dealt with, and examples are given from the earliest times down to the present day.

A. C. DUNSTAN.

SHEFFIELD.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

April—June 1940

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON (English),
F. P. PICKERING and R. TYMMS (German)

GENERAL

- DAUZAT, A., *L'Europe linguistique*. Paris, Payot. 40 fr.
FAWTIER, R., *Histoire du Moyen Âge de 1270 à 1328*. Paris, PUF. 60 fr.
HALPHEN, L., *Initiation aux études d'Histoire du Moyen Âge*. Paris, PUF. 18 fr.
REIFFERSCHIEDT, F. M., *Über die Sprache*. Leipzig, Hegner. 5 M. 50.
SETSCHKAREFF, W., *Schellings Einfluss in der russischen Literatur der 20. und 30. Jahre des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig, Harrassowitz.
TRAHARD, P., *Le Mystère poétique*. Paris, Boivin. 25 fr.
VALENCY, M. J., *Tragedies of Herod and Mariamne*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s.

Medieval Latin.

- LEROQUAIS, V., *Les Psautiers. MSS. latins des bibl. publ. de France*. Paris, Protat. 600 fr.

Italian.

- ADAMI, E., *La Lingua di Mussolini*. Modena, Tip. Modenese. L. 25.
ARIOSTO, L., *Carmina*, ed. Bolaffi. Modena, Tip. Modenese. L. 35.
BLUNT, A., *Artistic Theory in Italy*. Oxford Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.
BONNES, C., *Il dolce stil novo*. Modena, Tip. Modenese. L. 20.
CAMPANELLA, T., *Epilogo Magno*, ed. C. Ottaviano. Rome, R. Accademia d' Italia. L. 50.
CHIRI, G., *La Poesia epico-storica Latina dell' Italia medioevale*. Modena, Tip. Modenese. L. 35.
CONSOLI FIEGO, G., *Itinera literaria*. Naples, Ricciardi.
CONSOLI FIEGO, G., *Le Raccolte di Classici italiani*. Naples, Ricciardi.
FOGAZZARO, A., *Lettere scelte*, ed. T. Gallarati Scotti. Milan, Mondadori. L. 50.
GOLDONI, C., *Tutte le Opere*, ed. G. Ortolani, iv. Milan, Mondadori. L. 60.
JACONO, A., *Dizionario di esotismi*. Florence, Marzocco. L. 30.
RUMOR, M., *Giuseppe Giacosa*. Padua, CEDAM. L. 30.
SILBER, G. R., *The Influence of Dante and Petrarch on certain of Boccaccio's Lyrics*. Wisconsin, dissertation.
SORBELLI, A., *Storia della Università di Bologna, i: sec. XI–XV*. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 25.

Spanish, Catalan, Basque.

- CASTAÑEDA, C. E., and J. A. DABBS, *Guide to the Latin-American Manuscripts of the University of Texas Library*. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s. 6d.
CANÉ, M., *Juvenilia*, ed. A. Castro (Bibl. de clásicos argentinos). Buenos Aires, Estrada.

- COSSÍO, J. M. DE, *Siglo xvii: Espinosa, Góngora, Gracián, Calderón, Polo de Medina, Solís*. Madrid, Espasa-Calpe. 6 ptas.
- DIXON, P., *The Iberians of Spain*. Oxford Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.
- DUVAL, M., *From Cádiz to Cathay*. Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses. 16s
- GRACIÁN, *El Criticón*, ed. M. Romera Navarro. vol. iii. Univ. Pennsylvania Press.
- JONES, C. L., *Guatemala*. Minnesota and Oxford Univ. Presses. 22s. 6d.
- MANZONI, AIDA C., *El Indio en la poesía de América española*. Buenos Aires, Torres.
- MONNER SANZ, J. M., *Panorama del nuevo teatro*. Univ. de La Plata.
- MOYA, I., *El Americanismo en el teatro y la prédica de Sarmiento*. Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- PEERS, E. A., *Antonio Machado*. Oxford Univ. Press. 2s.
- Relação bibliográfica de Linguística americana, i*. Rio de Janeiro, Ministério de Educação.
- ROJAS, A. DE, *El Natural desdichado*, ed. J. W. Crowell. New York, Inst. de las Españas.
- SALINAS, P., *Reality and the Poet in Spanish Poetry*. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- SARMIENTO, D. F., *Facundo*, ed. Delia S. Etcheverry (Bibl. de clásicos argentinos). Buenos Aires, Estrada.
- SPENCER, F. E., and R. SCHEVILL, *The Dramatic Works of Luis Vélez de Guevara*. California Univ. Press.
- VALLE, R. H., *Bibliografía de Manuel Ignacio Altamirano* (Bibliografías Mexicanas, 8). México, DAPP.
- VEGA, LOPE DE, *El Palacio confuso*, ed. C. H. Stevens. New York, Inst. de las Españas.

Portuguese.

- ARNAUT, S. P., *António Nobre e a paisagem de Coimbra*. Coimbra.
- BASTO, A. DE MAGALHÃES, *Livro antigo de Cartas e Provisões de D. Afonso V, D. João II e D. Manuel I*. Porto, Arquivo Municipal.
- BASTO, C., *A Linguagem de Fialho*. Porto.
- FERNANDES, I. X., *Estudos de linguística*. Porto, Ed. Educação Nacional. \$15.
- JUCÁ, C., *O Pensamento e a expressão em Machado de Assis*. Rio de Janeiro.
- MARQUES, F. DA COSTA, *Camões poeta bucólico*. Coimbra.
- PATTEE, R., *Manoel de Oliveira Lima*. Lima, Univ. Católica.
- PEIXOTO, A., *História do Brasil*. Porto.
- PELLEGRINI, S., *Repertorio bibliografico della prima Lirica Portoghese*. Rome, Ist. Filologia Romanza dell' Università.
- PERDIGÃO, H., *Dicionário universal de Literatura*. Porto, Livraria Lopes da Silva. \$50.
- Relação da mui notável perda do galeão grande S. João*, ed. A. C. Pires de Lima. Porto.

French.

(a) *General (including Linguistic)*.

THÉRIVE, A., *Querelles de langage*. Paris, Stock. 21 fr.

(b) *Old French*.

Henry of Lancaster, *Le Livre de Seyntz Medicines*, ed. by E. J. Arnould (Anglo-Norman Texts, ii). Oxford, Blackwell. 30s.

RUGGIERI, R. M., *Epoëa francese*. Modena, Tip. Modenese. L. 10.

(c) *Modern French.*

- BALDENSBERGER, F., *Une Vie parmi d'autres*. Paris, Conard 35 fr.
 BARDECHE, M., Balzac, romancier. Paris, Plon. 80 fr.
 BARKER, FOCILLON, etc., *La Révolution de 1789 et la pensée moderne*. Paris, PUF. 50 fr.
 BODIN, J., *Théâtre*, 1. Scylla, Marcit, Antigone. Paris, PUF. 35 fr.
 CLARK, A. F. B., *Jean Racine*. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s.
 CROUZET, P., *Tout Racine ici*, à Port-Royal. Paris, Didier. 15 fr.
 DUCLAUX, MARY, *Racine*, tr. Oronod. Paris, Stock. 21 fr.
 DUMESNIL, R., et D. L. DEMOREST, *Bibliographie de Flaubert*. Paris, Giraud-Bodin. 65 fr.
 FECAROTTA, F., *L'Elemento storico del Cromwell di Victor Hugo*. Palermo, Andò. L. 15.
 FOSCA, F., *Edmond et Jules de Goncourt*. Paris, Michel. 35 fr.
 FOURCASSIE, J., *Le Romantisme et les Pyrénées*. Paris, NRF. 65 fr.
 HAŞEGANU, I., *La France dans l'œuvre des écrivains roumains contemporains de langue française*. Paris, Belles Lettres.
 LAFAYETTE, Mme DE, *Romans et nouvelles*, ed. E. Magne. Paris, Garnier. 15 fr.
 LALOU, R., *Histoire de la littérature française contemporaine*, ii. Paris, PUF. 60 fr.
 LANCASTER, H. C., *History of French dramatic Literature in the seventeenth century*, iv. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses.
 LEMAÎTRE, G., *André Maurois*. Stanford and Oxford Univ. Presses. 9s.
 MAULNIE, T., *Lecture de Racine*. Paris, NRF. 58 fr.
 MAUPASSANT, G. DE, *Chroniques, études, correspondance*, ed. R. Dumesnil. Paris, Grand. 75 fr.
 MAURIAC, F., *Journal*, iii. Paris, Grasset. 21 fr.
 MAURIAC, F., *Pascal*. Paris, Corrêa. 21 fr.
 ORESME, Maître N., *Le Livre de Ethiques d'Aristote*, ed. A. D. Menut. New York, Stechert. \$6.
 REES, G., *Remy de Gourmont*. Paris, Boivin. 45 fr.
 SAVORY, D. L., *Jean Racine*. Oxford Univ. Press. 1s.
 SEGOND, J., *Psychologie de Jean Racine*. Paris, Belles Lettres. 25 fr.
 VANDEREM, F., *La Bibliophilie nouvelle*, iii. Paris, Giraud-Bodin. 120 fr.
 VOLTAIRE, *Dialogues et anecdotes philosophiques*. Paris, Garnier. 18 fr.
 VOLTAIRE, *Poème sur la loi naturelle*, ed. F. J. Crowley. California and Cambridge Univ. Presses. 7s. 6d.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

English.(a) *General, including Linguistic.*

- ANDERSON, A. S., *The English Hundred Names. The South-Eastern Counties* (Lunds Univ. Årsskrift N.F. Avd. 1, Bd. 37, M. 1). Lund, Gleerup. 10 Kr.
 Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature, The, ed. for the Modern Humanities Research Association, vol. xix, 1938. Cambridge Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.
 BRONSON, B. H., J. R. CALDWELL, J. M. CLINE, G. MCKENZIE, and J. F. ROSS, *Five Studies in Literature*. California and Cambridge Univ. Presses. \$1.50.

DE RICOT, S., and W. J. WILSON, *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*. Vol. III, Indices. New York, W. H. Wilson. \$3.

Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue. From the Twelfth Century to the end of the Seventeenth, ed. by Sir W. Craigie. Part IX. Dignosce-Dull. Oxford Univ. Press. 21s.

MARPLES, M., *Public School Slang*. London, Constable. 10s.

PARTRIDGE, E., *Slang* (S.P.E. Tract, No. LV). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle English*.

DICKINS, B., J. M. Kemble and Old English Scholarship (Sir Isaac Gollancz Memorial Lecture, British Academy). London, H. Milford. 2s. 6d.

GWYNN, A., *The English Austin Friars in the Time of Wyclif*. London, H. Milford. 15s.

HUTSON, A. E., *British Personal Names in Historia Regum Britanniae*. California and Cambridge Univ. Presses. \$1.50.

MANLY, J. M., and E. RICKERT, *The Text of the Canterbury Tales*. 8 vols. Chicago and Cambridge Univ. Presses. £12.

SALUSBURY-JONES, G. T., *Street Life in Medieval England*. Oxford, The Pen-in-Hand Publishing Co. 5s.

Un ignoto Ricettario medico Inglese del XIV secolo trovato nel Bibliotheca Nazionale di Napoli, ed. by T. Vallese. Naples, Dino Amodio. L. 20.

(c) *Modern English*.

BAX, C., *The Life of the White Devil*. London, Cassell. 8s. 6d.

BRIDGES, R. and H. BRADLEY, *Correspondence, 1900-1923*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.

BRIGHT, T., *A Treatise of Melancholie*, ed. by H. Craig (Facsimile Text Soc.). Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 17s. 6d.

BRUNT, S., *A Voyage to Cocklogallnia*, ed. by M. Nicolson (Facsimile Text Soc.). Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 14s. 6d.

BUSH, D., *The Renaissance and English Humanism* (Alexander Lectures). Toronto and Oxford Univ. Presses.

Coleridge the Talker, ed. by R. W. Armour and R. F. Howes. Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 24s.

FRENCH, J. M., *Milton in Chancery*. New York, Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.; London, H. Milford. 24s.

GARRICK, D., *The Journal of, describing his visit to France and Italy in 1763*, ed. by G. W. Stone, Jr. New York, Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.; London, H. Milford. 7s.

HARRISON, G. B., *Elizabethan Plays and Players*. London, Routledge. 12s. 6d.

HARY, O., *The Letters of Lady Harriet Cavendish, 1796-1809*, ed. by Sir G. L. Gower and I. Palmer. London, Murray. 18s.

IRVING, W. H., John Gay. Durham, N.C., Duke Univ. Press. \$3 50.

KETTON-CREMER, R. W., *Horace Walpole*. London, Duckworth. 16s.

KINNE, W. A., *Revivals and Importations of French Comedies in England, 1749-1800*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 19s.

MARRIOTT, Sir J., *English History in English Fiction*. London, Blackie. 8s. 6d.

MILLETT, F. B., *Contemporary American Authors*. London, Harrap. 15s.

NICOLSON, H., *Byron: The Last Journey, April, 1823-April, 1824*. New ed. with a supplementary chapter. London, Constable. 6s.

Oxford Book of Christian Verse, The, ed. by Lord D. Cecil. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d.

- PECKHAM, H. H., Josiah Gilbert Holland in Relation to his Times. Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s. 6d.
- READ, WILLIAM A., Studies for, ed. by N. M. Caffee and T. A. Kirby. University. La., Louisiana State Univ. Press. \$4.50.
- REYNOLDS, G. F., The Staging of Elizabethan Plays. At the Red Bull Theater 1605-1625. Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer., London, H. Milford. 12s.
- ROSE, F., Les grands lyriques anglaises. Anthologie bilingue. Paris, Didier. 7s. 6d.
- RUDMAN, H. W., Italian Nationalism and English Letters. London, Allen and Unwin. 18s.
- SCUDDER, T., Jane Welsh Carlyle. London, Macmillan. 18s.
- SWIFT, J., The Prose Work, ed. by H. Davis. Vol. II, Bickerstaff Papers and Pamphlets on the Church. Vol. III, The Examiner and Other Pieces. Written in 1710-11. Oxford, Blackwell. £8. 8s. for set of fourteen vols.
- TEMPLE, SIR W., Three Essays, ed. by F. J. Fielden. Oxford Univ. Press, Indian Branch. 4s. 6d.
- WALPOLE, H., Correspondence with Madame du Deffand and Wiart, ed. by W. S. Lewis and W. H. Smith. Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. £12. 12s. for six vols.
- WILEY, B., The Eighteenth Century Background. London, Chatto and Windus. 15s.
- YEATS, W. B., Letters on Poetry to Dorothy Wellesley. Oxford Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.

German (Date, unless otherwise stated, 1939).

(a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen. Reihe *Formkunst*, III. Kulturhistorische Dichtung. Hrsg. von E. Stemplinger. Reihe *Selbstzeugnisse*, x. Hrsg. von E. Volkmann. Leipzig, Reklam.
- GLASSER, E., Einführung in die rassenkundliche Sprachforschung. Bd. 1. Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M. 80.
- Grosse Schweizer Forscher. Hrsg. von E. Fueter. Zurich, Atlantis Verlag.
- KLEIN, K. K., Literaturgeschichte des Deutschtums im Ausland (Ergänzungsband zur 5. Aufl. von Vogt und Koch, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur). Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut. 17 M. 50.
- KOCH, F., Geist und Leben. Vorträge und Aufsätze. Hamburg, Hanseat. Verl.-Anst. 9 M.
- MARTIN, B., Die deutsche Volkssprache. München, Hoheneichen-Verl.
- Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz. Hrsg. von der Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss. in München. Bd. III, T. 3: Bistum Bamberg. Bearb. von R. Ruf. München, Beck.
- PAUL, O., Deutsche Metrik, 2. Aufl. München, Hueber, 1938. 3 M. 50.
- PONGS, H., Das Bild in der Dichtung, II. Marburg, Elwert. 20 M.
- TSCHARNER, H. VON, China in der deutschen Dichtung bis zur Klassik. München, Reinhardt.

(b) *Old and Middle High German; Middle Low German.*

- BURDACH, K., Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation, Bd. VI, T. 3, Die Schriften Johannis von Neumarkt (Stachel der Liebe: Übersetzung des liber qui dicitur stimulus amoris). Hrsg. von Jos. Klapper. Berlin, Weidmann.
- ELSPERGER, A., Das Weltbild Rudolfs von Ems in seiner Alexanderdichtung. Diss. Erlangen.
- HALLER, J., Der Eintritt der Germanen in die Geschichte. Samml. Götschen.

- HORMANN, P., Untersuchungen zur Verslehre Otfrieds. Diss. Freiburg i. Br.
- LENZ, W., Der Ausgang der Dichtung von Walther und Hildegunde. Diss. Halle.
- LEUE, J., Hofisches in 'Van den vos Reinaerde'. Diss. Bonn.
- MULLER, H., Die Variation in der altgermanischen, alt- und mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung. Diss. Wurzburg.
- PICKERING, F. P., Notes on late medieval tales in praise of docta ignorantia. Reprinted from the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, xxiv. Manchester. Univ. Press. 1s. 6d.
- ROSENFELD, H. FR., Mittelniederlandische Reimchroniken. Greifswald, Bamberg. 3 M. 60.
- ROST, H., Die Bibel im Mittelalter. Augsburg, Sertz.
- STEINER, E., Gleichheit und Abweichungen im Wortschatz der althochdeutschen Bibelglossen und der zusammenhangenden Bibeltexte. Diss. Munchen.
- ULRICH VON TURHEIM, Rennewart. Hrsg. von Arthur Hubner (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, xxxix). Berlin, Weidmann, 1938.
- WOLFF, L., Das deutsche Schrifttum bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. Liefg. 1. (Handbuch d. deutschen Schrifttums, Bd. 1.) Potsdam, Athenaion.

(c) *Early New High German.*

- REINHARDT, C. P., Die Heidelberger Liedmeister des 16. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Heidelberg.

(d) *Modern German.*

- ACKERNECHT, E., Gottfried Keller. Geschichte seines Lebens. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 8 M. 50.
- ACKERMANN, O., Kant im Urteil Nietzsches. Tubingen, Mohr. 4 M. 20.
- BENZ, R. und SCHNEIDER, A. VON, Die Kunst der deutschen Romantik. Munchen, Piper. 18 M.
- BERGER, K., Die Balladen Schillers im Zusammenhang seiner lyrischen Dichtung. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt.
- BERTRAM, J., Goethes Faust im Blickfeld des xx. Jahrhunderts. Eine weltanschauliche Deutung. Hamburg-Altona, Dreizack-Verlag. 8 M.
- BUSSE, H. E., Grimmelshausen (Die Dichter der Deutschen, Folge 3). Stuttgart, Cotta.
- DZIALAS, I., Auffassung und Darstellung der Elemente bei Goethe. Berlin, Ebering. 6 M. 60.
- Ernst, Paul, und das Drama. Jahrbuch der Paul Ernst Gesellschaft. Langensalza.
- FLAKE, O., Grosse Damen des Barock. Berlin, S. Fischer.
- FREDÉN, G., Friedrich Menius und das Repertoire der englischen Komödianten in Deutschland. Diss. Upsala. Stockholm, Palmers.
- GEBBARD, A., Der deutsche Bauernroman seit 1900. Diss. Danzig. Danzig, Muller.
- GERSTNER, H., Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit. Munchen, Eher. 5 M. 80.
- Gorres, Josef von. Gesammelte Schriften. Bd. xvi: Aufsätze in den Hist.-polit. Blättern. T. 2, 1845-8. Köln, Bachem. 8 M.
- Grillparzer, Franz. Samtliche Werke. Hist.-krit. Gesamtausg. Hrsg. von A. Sauer, fortgef. von Reinhold Backmann. Abt. I, Bd. xix: Apparat zur Melusine, zum Hannibal, und zu Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen. Wien, Schroll. 12 M.
- GROSSMANN, R., Rilke und der französische Symbolismus. Jena, Neuenhahn.
- Harsdorffer, G. Ph. Poetischer Trichter. Hrsg. von R. Marquier. Berlin, Rabenpresse. 3 M.

- Hebbel-Jahrbuch (Jahrgang 1). Hrsg. von D. Colln. Heide, Westholstem. Verl.-Anst. 2 M. 40.
- HEESCH, K., Gottfried Kellers 'Gruener Heinrich' als Bildungsroman des deutschen Realismus. Diss. Hamburg.
- HEMMINGHAUS, E., Mark Twain in Germany. New York, Columbia Univ. Press.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von. Briefe an Karl Gustav von Brinkmann. Hrsg. und erläutert von A. Leitzmann (Bibl. des Literar. Vereins in Stuttgart, 288). Leipzig.
- Kant, The Heritage of. Edited by D. F. Bowers and G. T. Whitney. Princeton Univ. Press.
- KEIN, O., Schellings Kategorielehre. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 6 M.
- KOSCHLIG, M., Grimmelshausen und sein Verleger. Untersuchungen über die Chronologie seiner Schriften und den Echtheitscharakter der frühen Ausgaben. Leipzig, Akad. Verlagsges. 25 M.
- KUNZ, W., Gestaltwirklichkeit und Lebensgestaltung. Zur Geschichte des deutschen Idealismus (1780-1830). Leipzig, Armanen-Verlag. 8 M.
- LICHTENBERGER, H., Goethe. T. 2. Paris, Didier.
- MICHEL, V., C. M. Wieland (Études de litt. étrangère et comparée, 10). Paris, Boivin.
- MULLER, GUNTHER, Geschichte der deutschen Seele. Vom Faustbuch zu Goethes Faust. Freiburg, Herder. 12 M.
- PEUCKERT, W. E., Angelus Silesius: Cherubinischer Wandersmann (Sammlung Dieterich, 64). Leipzig, Dieterich.
- PITROU, R., Rainer Maria Rilke: Les thèmes principaux de son œuvre. Paris, Albin Michel. 18 fr.
- POWELL, P., Pierre Corneilles Dramen in deutschen Bearbeitungen und auf der deutschen Bühne bis zum Anfang des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts und deren Verhältnis zur zeitgenössischen Literatur in Deutschland. Diss. Rostock. Emsdetten, Lechte.
- PRADEL, J., Studien zum Prosastil Clemens Brentanos. Halle, Akad. Verlag. 4 M. 90.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. Briefe an einen Freund (Karl Heinrich Sack). Weimar, Deutsche Christen. 1 M. 25.
- SCHMIDT-PAULI, E., Rainer Maria Rilke. Ein Gedenkbuch. Basel, Schwabe. 4 M. 80.
- SCHNEIDER, HERMANN, Richard Wagner und das germanische Altertum (Philosophie und Geschichte, 66). Tübingen, Mohr.
- Scholz, Wilhelm von. An Ilm und Isar. Lebenserinnerungen. 6 M. 80.
- Spee, Friedrich von, Cautio criminalis oder Rechtliches Bedenken wegen der Hexenprozesse. Deutsche Ausgabe von J. F. Ritter. (Forschungen zur Geschichte des deutschen Strafrechts, 1.) Weimar, Bohlau.
- Stifter, Adalbert. Samtliche Werke. Bd. XII: Die Mappe meines Urgrossvaters. Aus den nachgelassenen Hss. erstmals hrsg. von Franz Huller. Briefwechsel, Bd. VII. Hrsg. von G. Wilhelm. Reichenberg, Kraus. 7 M. 50 and 5 M.
- STUYVER, WILHELMINE, Deutsche expressionistische Dichtung im Lichte der Philosophie der Gegenwart. Amsterdam, Paris. 3.75 fl.
- WEINRICH, R., Vom Wort und Gedanken der Arbeit bei Goethe. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 6 M. 50.